This is a reproduction of a library book that was digitized by Google as part of an ongoing effort to preserve the information in books and make it universally accessible.

Google™ books

https://books.google.com

ANDOVER-HARVARD LIBRARY
AH 68FA N

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

CONDUCTED BY

W. K. PENDLETON.

CO-EDITOR:

PROF. C. L. LOOS.

These things I write unto thee, * * * that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.—1 Tim. iii. 14. 15.

Contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.—Jude.

VOLUME XLI.

BETHANY, W. V.:
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY W. K. PENDLETON.

1870

Digitized by Google

1556
1-4-4

Digitized by Google

Period,
1185.75
v.41
1870

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., JANUARY, 1870. [No. I.

INTRODUCTION TO VOL. XLI.

The new year greets us with many tokens of promise and hope. Our list of old and true friends remains almost unbroken by a withdrawal, and new names are coming in to take their place in the ranks of the faithful and true, who have stood by us for so many years. We are cheered by the warmest encouragement of many, whose approbation is a criticism of highest compliment, and so are stimulated to try, as far as in us lies, to make the Harbinger of 1870, better than that of any previous year. During the last year, we have done much to improve its *material* dress, and make it more in harmony with the style and quality of the literary treasures with which it has been our earnest endeavor to fill its pages. The great majority of our readers preserve the Harbinger for binding, and we have so improved the quality o the paper and printing, as to make it more fit for this honor.— The matter, we trust, is in the main such as will bear to be kept for after years, and prove an ever useful fountain of knowledge and instruction to the students of the Bible. We intend to keep it so that no patron of its pages shall be ashamed to show it to friend or foe.

The age is full of restless inquiry, and the public press is equally full of crude and superficial speculation and dogmatism on many of the most vital questions that can agitate the mind and heart of man. All sorts of helmsmen are assuming the rudder,

Digitized by Google

and adventurous voyagers show but little concern to whose guidance they commit themselves. New papers spring up like mushrooms, and enterprise in this form, is rapidly becoming more a matter of money, than of religion. This is an evil of the times, which only time can cure. Let us wait the operation of the remedy, and do the best we can while the patient is suffering. If we have too many papers for the good of Editors, they yet subserve an end not unfruitful of other good,—and so Christ is preached, let us rejoice together.

We honestly confess that we think the great multiplication of feeble papers—feeble in their own strength because of the feebleness of the support which holds them up—a sorrowful evil. We doubt not, every editor, who is pining under public neglect, agrees with me in this. Unappreciated genius is proverbially sensitive, and if subscribers do not come up in admiring "Clubs" to sustain us, we naturally turn in resentment upon some unworthy intruder who stops them by the way, and blame *him* for our failure. We rashly conclude that nine-tenths of the aspirants for patronage should be incontinently garroted, but we never think of giving our own neck to the noose. This would be suicide, and against this there is law. How, then, shall the too crowded ranks be thinned? As before stated, we leave the solution to time; and for ourselves, with what skill and force a quarter of a century of hard study, hard work, and hard experience has developed in us, we conclude to write on and continue to publish.

We owe a word of explanation to our indulgent readers, as to the unusual delay in the monthly visits of the Harbinger, especially during the latter part of the year. This has been, in great measure, unavoidable. At one time, disappointment in getting suitable paper; then the necessity of employing a new press; then the absence of my printer; then my own absence on important public service for the church and college: these and other less matters threw things behind time, and, isolated as my office is from the ordinary facilities for calling in casual aid, and particular as I aim to be, as to the kind of matter which I admit into my pages, it has been somewhat difficult to get the issue up to time. Perhaps I have not felt this to be a matter of so much importance, as it is to many. It has seemed to me, that, as the matter of the Harbinger is not of that ephemeral nature which makes its value depend upon the *time* at which it is read, there is not

Digitized by Google

quite the same necessity for its reaching the reader punctually on a given day per month, as is felt in the case of a weekly. But, I discover that in this I am in good measure mistaken. The interest excited in questions, the discussion of which is continued through several numbers, makes us greedy to renew the examination; and besides this, when the time comes for the arrival of an old and expected friend, we are naturally impatient of delays.—We feel the force of these considerations, and intend to do better for the future. We ask our kind friends to remember how many things we have to do,—that we try to do everything faithfully and well, and that we have no art in slighting our work in order to hurry it through,—and then we submit ourself to their merciful judgment.

We make no detailed promises here of what we shall present through our pages in the course of the present volume. It is only necessary to say, that we shall keep a watchful eye on all the great interests of the church, and discuss with kindness and care every topic that seems of importance to her prosperity and peace. W. K. P.

A TRAGEDY AND ITS LESSON.

The terrible case of assassination that occurred in the city of New York,—that of Richardson by McFarland,—from its cause and the circumstance that closed in the last acts of the awful tragedy, has in an unusual manner, aroused public attention.—We hope that the *dramatic interest* in this horrible event will not pass away from the public mind without working permanent good, and awakening the conscience and uniting the moral and religious power of the land, to arrest and drive back a current of demoralization that is making its way through the social life of the nation. It is not the simple fact of the murder that has awakened the public feeling; that is now so common a thing in New York, that the excitement it occasions is ordinarily very sluggish and short-lived. In the present case, it is not only the interest in the murdered man, who had gained some eminence and many warmly attached friends among prominent men, but it is the fact, that a great social question, and one of high moral and

Digitized by Google

religious import, is so prominently and essentially connected with it.

Terrible as the word may seem, yet we boldly say it, it does appear that such is the apathy of the public conscience, sometimes such the dull, selfish indifference of a people's moral sense toward a deep, foul pollution that is slowly and insidiously spreading itself, like a fatal poison, through its social life, that only some awful, crushing, bloody catastrophe,—some terrible divine judgment, can arouse it to see, feel, and act. If this tragedy, in all its acts, as now revealed to the public, will have the good effect,—of which we are not too hopeful,—of arousing and enlightening the moral sense of the people, all over the land, and lead them effectually to stem the tide of licentious thought and licentious legislation, relative to the marital relations and obligations, that has wrought this crime with many others, and is undermining the very foundations of the order, purity, and happiness of social life,—then we may believe, that the blood, the agony, the horror of this event have not been in vain;—we may believe that the angel of judgment has smitten society with a stroke to awaken it from this guilty indifference, and this winking at a flagrant violation of a fundamental law of God, made alike for all men and all ages.

A woman, who is yet by the laws of God and of the land the legitimate wife of a man with whom she is living, and is the mother of his children, accepts and reciprocates the attentions and affections of another man,—this man Richardson; after this sin against God and against the sanctity and obligations of the marriage vow, solemnly assumed, has continued a considerable time, this woman, without the knowledge of her husband, goes to Indiana, remains there a sufficient length of time to entitle her to a divorce by the laws of that State,—sues for and obtains this divorce, the husband all this time being ignorant even of her whereabouts, which, after the strictest inquiry, he is unable to discover, and in the suit for the divorce is consequently never heard. Besides this, the New Testament ground for separation does not exist. The husband executes vengeance on the man who has seduced his wife from him by assassinating him; and finally, Rev. H. W. Beecher, in the presence of two other clergymen, O. B. Frothingham, a rationalist of the extreme school, and H. M. Field, editor of *The Evangelist*, a Presbyterian paper, marries

Digitized by Google

the woman to the dying man. It may be added, that the laws of New York do not recognize the legality of this easily-gotten Indiana divorce. This is the case,—not a singular one, of course, for many like it, the murder excepted, are constantly occurring by virtue of these licentious divorce laws of several States,—prominently, however, of Indiana, whose bad eminence in this respect, is becoming a jest, a mockery, and a by-word over all the land.

The institution of marriage is ordained of God, not only for the church, but also for the whole world; He alone gave it to society, and His law is to rule it. There is nothing in the New Testament law of marriage that is not as applicable, practicable, and necessary outside of the church as within it. It is not like an ordinance of the church only, that is illegitimate and impracticable outside of it. Yet we dare not hope that the State will adhere, in its legislation on marriage and divorce, strictly to the law of the New Testament; Christians, however, cannot take advantage of any legislative departure from the divine law; they must obey God. But even *in* the church, we find this question of divorce and consequent marriage to another person, is constantly coming up. One of our papers has been obliged, time after time, to answer the question, Whether a member of the church can legitimately (in a scriptural sense), be divorced and marry again, except on the ground stated by Christ, Matth. xix. 9?—and cases are constantly occurring in the congregations of the violation of this law of Christ, to the grief of the church and the corruption of good morals.

It is not our purpose to go into a full discussion of the Christian law of divorce, and the sanctity and obligations of the marital relation,—but simply to call attention to the question and the sentiments regarding it that have found public utterance, and on some of them to offer some strictures.

No language can be clearer and more decisive than the words of Christ in the passage just alluded to, which we ask the reader to place before his eye; the law is plainly given, and the good reason for it indicated, as one existing in the original purpose of God in instituting marriage,—'in the beginning.' But the restlessness and uneasiness of men under the restrictions of the divine law, have constantly urged them to break away from it and seek a wider liberty in breaking the marriage relation. In commenting on the case before us, the *Independent* says:

Digitized by Google

"The horrible case is a new illustration of the folly and wickedness of that semi-superstitious sentiment which, in the name of maintaining the sanctity of marriage, outrageously perverts the very idea of marriage, by compelling the life-long union of two persons, either of whom finds such a union to be loathsome, degrading and unholy. There is no divine, and there ought to be no human, law to compel the continuance of any marriage which, so long as it continues, is nothing better than legalized prostitution. 'Whom *God* hath joined together':—that, and that only, is the divine idea of marriage. Anything short of this is abomination. To chain two human beings fast to each other's side, against the perpetual protest of galled and wounded human nature, is an offense at which angels weep. The great, indifferent public have no right to say, either on the basis of any statute law, or on the deeper basis of any popular sentiment, or on the still deeper basis of any supposed religious tenet, *that any two individuals, man and woman, shall live together as husband and wife, against the inward protest of their own individual souls.* Derived from whatever source, based on whatever foundation, sanctioned by whatever tradition, such a legalized tyranny is unworthy of a Christian civilization, shamefully perverts the fundamental teachings of Christianity, and destroys the sacred claim of religion to the reverence of mankind.

"In so momentous a matter as divorce, and in view of the hideous tragedies with which it is constantly filling the journals, it is time to take steps toward a uniform legislation on this subject for the whole land; instead of leaving every successive case, as now, to be first legalized, then nullified—first done and then undone—under the thirty-seven different laws of the thirty-seven different States."

We have confidence that the intelligent readers of the *Harbinger* will be able to see clearly, through the disguise of the rhetorical moral indignation of this passage, the scandalous sentiments therein set forth. The *Independent* need not deceive itself; there are abundantly men on whom all this tragic pathos, when used to cover up a hideous abomination of doctrine, will not have the slightest effect. Rhetorical passion is appreciated and felt when used in advocating what is true and pure; when used in behalf of what is false and corrupt, it is rejected as worthless and offensive. Intelligent Christians, who revere the law of the New Testament above all else, and "lead captive every thought" (and this "every thought" embraces all these 'protests of their own individual

Digitized by Google

souls') "to the obedience of Christ," see and feel as well as this writer, and all other advocates of relaxing the New Testament law of marriage, the griefs of an ill-assorted marriage, and are willing to apply all just legal and scriptural remedies. One thing, however, they will not consent to,—the abrogation of God's law in the case,— and this is what these innovators demand.

What is the doctrine taught by the *Independent?* Avowedly and openly it is this:—that man and woman are to maintain their marriage vow only as long as there is no 'protest against it by their own individual souls.' This, of course, means not only when the 'protest' comes from both, but from either of the two, as in the present case. The husband or wife, that under the easy freedom of such a law of marriage, had sought, and found and cultivated some other object of affection than the one to which the marriage vow was given, would at once find the most powerful 'protest' 'of his own individual soul' against the present bonds, which would become 'insupportable and loathing.' The world is filled with such cases. '"Whom *God* hath joined together":—that, and that only, is the divine idea of marriage.' Certainly;—but we protest solemnly against this free-and-easy perversion of the Word of God, to make it mean what God evidently did not mean by it. The doctrine here taught by the *Independent* is, that it is not by the act and ordinance of marriage that God joins man and woman together as husband and wife; and that this union is always subject, any day, to the revision of 'their own individual souls,' to ratify the union, or abolish it as null and void. The solemn act of marriage really by such a doctrine becomes worthless; for the decision as to whether 'God hath united' these souls, is to be made, as by 'the court of the last instance,' not by any ordinance, divine or human, but by the 'individual souls themselves.' It means that when the officiating minister marries a couple, he is to say, '—— but whenever either or both of you shall discover from your own individual feeling that you do not belong to each other, then you may be assured that God hath not joined you, and that this marriage is null and void. You are the judges of this yourselves.' This is precisely what it amounts to; the reality and legality is left to the decision on subsequent reflection of 'their own individual souls.' We have here a repetition of the old Satanic delusion and temptation:—"You shall be as God,"—i. e., you shall be your own God; the

Digitized by Google

voice of 'your own individual soul' is the voice of God! Some years ago, a book of great power and effect was written in Germany, the object of which was to illustrate the Satanic delusions of rationalistic infidelity in that land. Its significant title was, *Eritis sicut Deus*, 'You shall be as God;'—for this word of Satan is the 'fountain and beginning,' the life and soul of rationalism, that is, of making man's own heart and reason his God, the first and final arbiter of right and wrong. Such was the *title* of the work; and the author developed and illustrated it by the working of the very rule with reference to marriage taught by the *Independent*. In a chaste but most powerful manner, there is made to pass before the reader the history, taken from actual contemporary life, of men and of women, illustrative of terrible aberrations from the virtue and the purity of the marriage relation, induced by accepting the doctrine that 'the intimations and decisions of our own souls are the divine law to us.' Married men and women, in the most respectable spheres of life, among them preachers, without scruple and without disguise, according to the oft-changing inclinations of their hearts, enter upon new loves, and break and contract marriage bonds at will, and repeatedly. This is no fancy picture; the plainest mind can see that it is the direct and inevitable effect of such teaching. We name only a single case, because of its prominence. Schleiermacher, the prince of the rationalists of his day, and by no means of the extremists, and a man otherwise of the highest character, early in life became passionately attached to Eleonora Grunow, the gifted wife of a Lutheran clergyman at Berlin. This attachment was fully reciprocated; they formally,—as in the case so pathetically plead by the *Independent*, of Mrs. McFarland and Richardson,—plighted their vows to each other, and it was decided that as soon as Schleiermacher should be assured of a permanent position and support, a divorce should be obtained, and she should become his wife. And all this with the perfect knowledge and consent of her husband; and all this time, too, Schleiermacher was theological student, preacher, and professor of theology! This relation of these 'two loving and faithful hearts,'—as the religious and other defenders of the hero and heroine of the New York tragedy have it,—continued for many years,—till 1805,—based on the idea of the 'affinity of souls'; and was only broken up when maturer years and reason supervened, and a better understanding and a

Digitized by Google

higher and purer Christian faith took possession of the great theologian's heart.

We have in chemistry what is called 'elective affinity.' Two substances have an affinity for each other, and form a union, a compound. But by-and-by this compound is brought within the near influence of *two new* substances, for which the united parts have a stronger affinity than for each other; they separate,—each selects, by the power of a 'stronger affinity,' one of the new substances, and two new compounds are formed;—and so the process may be varied indefinitely. Precisely this is the law applied to the marital relation; and the licentious and abominable idea has been illustrated by Goethe in his 'Elective Affinities.'

The subtle temptation of Satan that entices men to yield to the power and play of these 'elective affinities,' has led and is leading many souls astray, in the very face of the most earnest reproaches of conscience. "Resist the devil, and he will flee from you", is the voice of God; resist the tempter in his first approaches; *obsta principiis*,—in this alone lies all safety. Christ distinctly teaches in his sermon on the mount, that the *heart* must be sacredly guarded as before God's all-seeing eye, from the first inward motion of the sin that would taint the purity, in the soul's sanctuary, of the holy relation.

The unembellished, gross reality of this licentious notion of marriage, is with a vulgar familiarity, and a keen relish for the bad and vile in sentiment, unblushingly set forth in the 'outgivings' of some of the prurient souls in the 'Woman's Rights Association.' We shall not pollute the pages of the *Harbinger* with the utterances of these male and female apostles of marital 'elective affinities.' Immediately after the bloody tragedy ending with this sinful, law-defying, 'ghastly' marriage of life to death, this Woman's Rights Association held a session in New York, and finding rich, palatable food in this case, exhausted its welcome, attractive material *ad nauseam*. After glorifying the bold aiders, abettors and advocates of it, they finished by passing resolutions demanding 'easy divorces' by law, by which the experiment of marriage can be varied and repeated according to inclinations. If any one doubts whether the views advocated by these people have this extreme bearing, we call his attention to the words of Mill, given below, and to the language of a Mrs. Norton, who is 'a shining light' in this association. She said on this oc-

Digitized by Google

casion, that "the condition in which the woman had six or eight husbands, was better than that in which they now live." Of course, no one will look for an extreme beyond this.

We do not charge the *Independent* with intending or desiring all this; but we are simply showing what really is the legitimate consequence of its teaching. Moreover, it claims to talk of what is *God's law* in the case, and it affects to speak with a bold passion and with authority. Such high assumptions deserve to be signally rebuked, when made in behalf of what is essentially bad.

The law of God in the case is plain beyond all controversy.—But if these men,—we mean those of them, yet claiming to respect morality and religion, reject the 'authority of the *word*,' as held by old-fashioned Christian believers, we will say to them, Is then, henceforth, the life of virtue to be 'but a flowery bed of ease?' is the path of duty to be only one of undisturbed comfort and pleasure? are high and holy obligations to be accepted and borne only so long as they demand no painful sacrifice of self? Are the great maxims of a noble, heroic life, immortal in honor through the ages, and the yet loftier inspirations of the religion of the Bible, that through a brave and often lifelong endurance under wrong, through a patient continuance in well-doing amid reproaches and bitter sacrifices, have made heroes of men and women, martyrs to great virtues, all now to be separated from human life, from all our conceptions of moral and religious greatness and nobility of soul? Are men and women no longer to be taught to grow great by the discipline of patient endurance and suffering? Have the great examples of such suffering and enduring to the end, all been mockeries, follies,—vain self-delusions? Women, noble-souled women, under the crushing weight and the dark shadow of conjugal infidelity, with heroic fortitude of mind faithful to their single vow at the altar,—"cherishing it as a holy vestal fire in the sanctuary of their hearts," going on fulfilling the sacred duties of wife and mother,—were these all misguided, silly fools? blind devotees to a fanatical delusion? Yes, so it seems according to these apostles of a new age, a new morality, a new religion! The highest obligations of life are to be assumed only on a light and easy tenure, and to be borne only so long as they demand no heart-oppressing sacrifices, no pains, no tears; when the yoke galls our shoulders, we can instantly slip it, and go out free. Is this piety to God? is this piety to men,—to father and mother, to brother and sister,

Digitized by Google

o children, to wife or husband? Is this the greatness of virtue, and the moral heroism we are to honor and sustain? If it is, then all the examples of heroic, self-devoting virtue in the past, are a vain delusion, and the religion of the Bible a deceit!

It is truly encouraging to know that the strong press, religious and secular, in great majority in New York and elsewhere, has boldly denounced this marriage and its defense. The *N. Y. Observer* expresses itself in the severest, but yet not unwarranted, language:

"To us, the whole case,—the seduction, the murder, the sympathy, the nominal marriage,—constitute the most disgusting and demoralizing chapter in the annals of social and domestic life.—We read nothing worse in the worst days of London or Paris society.

"It needed the farce of a pretended marriage solemnized by two ministers, to complete the ghastly drama. The astounding ceremony to the horror of the Christian community, was actually performed, and the guilty bridegroom passed from this nuptial tragedy to his reckoning with Him who has said, 'Thou shalt not commit adultery,' as well as 'Thou shalt not kill.'

"These two commandments govern our views of the right and wrong of this triple crime."

The *Christian Intelligencer*, one of the most prominent religious journals of New York, declares this death-bed wedding presided over by Mr. Beecher, "a flagrant violation of the Christian law of marriage," and adds "that public opinion has condemned it in the most open and unmistakable manner, and that every periodical in the land which is not lost to decency, and has noticed the affair at all, has spoken of it in fitting terms of rebuke." It says further of the general question:

"This is one of the live questions of the hour, and while the subject is prominently before the public mind, it should be put into such shape that there will be no mistaking the sentiment of the community. The matter of personal reputation is always worthy of due consideration, but personal regard must stand aside in a case like this. The fact is there is an organized opposition to the sacredness of the institution upon which the very existence of the family is dependent. The developments which have grown out of the recent complication of crimes, as side is-

Digitized by Google

sues, are of so pronounced a character, that every one who has an honest desire for the maintenance of domestic virtue and the decencies of public morality in social life, has a personal interest in the maintenance of Christian sentiment on this subject. There is no safety for the community except in firm adherence to the law of the New Testament. The law is explicit, and admits of but one honest interpretation. All the evasions of the sophists who plead that God has not joined together those whose 'affinities' are as vagrant as their dissolute eyes or passions can make them, are simply devices of the enemy, and those who employ such arguments are the avowed enemies of the law of God, and are plotting for the subversion of the family as a divine institution."

The *Evening Post* (William Cullen Bryant's paper) quoting the language of the *Independent* above cited, remarks:

"In other words, every person is to be the judge, after taking the marriage vows, whether or not it is degrading or not to keep them; and if it seems so, ought to be at liberty to break them.—Does the *Independent* mean that, in such a case, every such person ought to be at liberty to contract other marriage relations, without restrictions? If so, none will question that the remarks are pertinent to the case it discusses.

"We presume the *Independent* will admit that Christianity has hitherto been supposed to teach, that a man and woman who marry are supposed to have made up their minds irrevocably to a union for life; and that society has a right to hold them to their vows. Does that journal now believe that this view is wrong, and that marriage is an experiment, which may be tried again and again until those engaged in it are suited?

"Mr. Mill, in his recent work on the subjection of women, directly says that a state of society in which a woman should be at liberty to "choose her master," and to try again and again, until she is suited, would be preferable to that we now have. And in all the discussion which has been suggested by the recent unfortunate public marriage of one man to the wife of another, on his dying bed, the division between those who approve the marriage and those who disapprove it, has corresponded with singular exactness to the division between the advocates of women's suffrage and its opponents. This suggests the inquiry whether there is any logical necessity which compels the woman's rights movement gradually, but rapidly, to identify itself with the movement against marriage and against the family?"

Digitized by Google

It becomes the sacred and urgent duty of those who revere the Sacred Scriptures as the law of God, and who respect the sacred obligations of marriage as therein divinely established, to speak and act in defense of the the law of God and the laws of man in harmony with it, and against the licentious doctrine that would undermine these. The whole question of divorce demands a full examination from the Christian standpoint and in the light of history, to dissipate, if possible, the destructive delusions that are leading captive many minds,—delusions that are not the result of any ambiguity in the law of the New Testament on this subject, but rather the darkening and bewildering effects of misguided, unrestrained passions, that seek for indulgence and excuse, and find it, *because* they eagerly seek it. Whatver 'liberal' laws the State may make, the Church of God should maintain itself in doctrine and discipline in this matter, as in every other, strictly and unflinchingly on the Word of God. C. L. L.

MUSICAL CULTURE.

Music is a science, and therefore God is its author and ordained its laws. All melodies and harmonies dwelt in the mind of the Creator, before the morning stars sang together, and the sons of God shouted for joy;—therefore man did not *invent* Music, and after 6000 years of trial, he is now only making discoveries in the charming world of harmony.

But what is Music? Music is sound. Air waves, harmonized or made melodious according to the laws of time and tune, trembling along the ether path, coy, timid, shrinking, stealing to our ear, half afraid to touch the nerve, yet arousing with their light tread ecstasies in human souls, so rich, so varied, so overpowering, that they paint upon the tablets of our hearts all that we have ever imagined, in our dream pictures, of Paradise. But music has its moods. It does not always steal upon us in zephyr tones. It sometimes comes in its might, and power, and majesty. It thunders forth wonderful harmonies—great volumes of sound—mighty melodies that rush like tempests through our souls, awakening all enthusiasms, and all sublimities, and all great passions, and all wild emotions. Celestial motors, hitherto latent, are aroused, and the whole world within us is shaken, agitated, sub-

Digitized by Google

lined, and opened to the reception of thought that lifts us nearer to God and prepares us for the society of supernal hosts.

Music is sound, but all sounds are not music, and yet we are strangely under the control of sounds in nature which cannot be ranked under the head of music. So universally is this felt, that poets call all sounds music, that arouse vivid emotions in the human heart.

"'Tis not in the harp's soft melting tone,
That music and harmony dwell alone;
'Tis not in the voice so tender and clear,
That comes like an angel's song on the ear;
They both are sweet, but o'er dale and hill,
For me, there's as beautiful music still.

I hear it in every murmuring breath
That waves the bells of the purple heath,
In the watch dog's bark, in the shepherd's song,
In the rustic's laugh as it echoes along,
In the whirring sound of the wild bird's wing,—
There's music, there's music in everything."

Very many persons are soothed into forgetfulness of all irritations, and even of actual woes, by the sweet, soft sound of summer eves—when the last warble of the birds is heard, ere they drop into their cosy nests, and weird tones fill all the air.—'Tis then that emotions the most tender are aroused in our hearts. Days and loved ones long passed away come back again. We lose all sense of the present, and live again in the beautiful past, when we were young, and full of life and strength and hope;—when the world was all a beautiful ideal, and the future full of sunny faces and bright eyes, and merry voices—when song and dance and laugh come back to us, and we are again in the midst of the loving and beloved, many of whom have passed away to the silence and night of the tomb. We awake from the dream and we see around us only the wrecks of what has been. Graves are at our feet, nature's song is hushed,—the birds have gone to slumber, the soft twilight has disappeared, a solemn stillness is upon all things, and darkness sinks down upon our hearts, as on the face of the world around us.

Others hear strange, wild music, when the winds are high—when the clouds are rushing through the tempest-tossed sky—when the ocean is madly leaping and foaming and singing the

Digitized by Google

anthem of the storm—when lurid lightnings leap from the bosom of black thunder clouds—then, in the jubilee of the tempest, there are great emotions swelling within our souls—emotions of grandeur, sublimity, worship—emotions that humble and yet make us proud. We kneel, and half affrighted, pour forth a prayer. We feel proud to know that He who controls and directs the storm is our Great Father, and that we are the children of his love.

Thus, sounds, mere tremblings of the atmosphere, have a strange power over us. They depress us to sadness we cannot tell why. They bring back the glowing past. They arouse within us enthusiasm, courage, energy for the battle of life. In these sounds there is no human language—not a word to convey a thought—not a single premise laid down, nor a conclusion drawn, yet thoughts whirl through our brain and emotions swell our hearts as we listen. Who has not felt the stirring sounds of martial music—who does not grasp his sword and long for battle-fields, as he hears the trumpet call to arms, or listens to the crash of cymbals or to the loud sounding timbrel? Who does not melt into tenderness under the influence of the clear dulcet notes of a human voice? Who does not bow in worship under the touching, thrilling, majestic tones of an organ? In truth, music—sound—has a wonderful power over us whether it comes through a human larynx, or the pipes of an organ, or the strings of a harp; the effect is the same—altogether emotional. Nor are these emotions always pleasant. We thrill with horror under the maniac's laugh; we tremble with fear under the shout of mighty masses of men swayed and governed by dark and dangerous passions; we are aroused to anger by the voice of taunting and insult. The passionate tones of the orator move us to tears, or terror, or fury. In a word, our whole emotional nature is controlled by *sound*.

Can such a power as this be given to the world merely to amuse it? Was it intended by its author that its influence should be felt by the rich and cultured alone? Was it excluded from hovels and cabins, the abodes of poverty? No; like all of God's great gifts to man, it is universal. Song is everywhere. Sweet sounds, like gushing waters, or gentle zephyrs, or golden sunshine, or beauteous flowers, are penetrating into cottages and palaces alike, making toil more grateful to the serf, and expelling demons from the hearts of kings.

Digitized by Google

Man is the only earthly being capable of producing harmony. Animals have their own modes of expressing happiness and it is pleasant to hear them. But music, properly so called, is produced by man alone. Why was this charming faculty conferred on him? It must be intimately interwoven with his well-being—moulding his life—shaping his character—elevating or degrading him. Shall we leave to the developments of chance what should be cultivated? Shall we cultivate this great power as an accomplishment merely,—to be studied or not as we have time or means? Or shall we look upon it as of transcendent importance to the well-being of man?

To place music in its right position it must be made an essential part of a good education. It must come in not as an antagonist, but as the confederate of the most severe and exact sciences. Who originated the idea that music could not exist in the same brain with mathematics? Who gave the thought to the world that music was beneath the attention of the Philosopher? Surely if there be any one who needs the quickening, elevating, soothing influence of music more than another, it is he whose brain power has been depressed and overtaxed by severe application.

> "O give me music, for my soul doth faint;
> I'm sick of noise and care, and now my soul
> Longs for some dying plaint, that may
> The Spirit from its cell unsphere."

The effect of this "concord of sweet sounds" is marvelous, electric. The mind leaps up from beneath the pressure, and returns to its toil with renewed life and energy. Music is then nature's great stimulant for a mind depressed, and the want of a knowledge how to use this charming excitant leads many a student to the use of narcotic drugs or to the wine cup, for a renewal of the vital energy of the brain so essential to concentrated thought.

There is, then, no class of men who demand the grateful, cheering, composing influence of music more than patient, laborious, absorbed students, and therefore the University needs its influence more than the Common School or the Ladies' Seminary.

We have degraded music into a mere parlor accomplishment. We deem that strong men cannot condescend to so trifling an amusement, and therefore we have given it over to the ladies.—This we deem to be unwise. God never gave this beautiful talent

Digitized by Google

to humanity to be thus ignored. Many a family has been saved from sorrow and ruin by gathering, at the close of day, the sons and daughters of the household around the piano, organ, or harp, and in the midst of soul-filling harmonies, losing all wish to visit the theatre, opera, or drinking saloon. O these dark, dismal, cheerless, soulless, inharmonious, discordant households! What a dismal power they are to urge the young to destruction! No wonder the pleasure-loving boy wishes to escape from the presence of scowling parents—no wonder that he rushes from the deserted fireside, to the society of congenial souls—where he can have bright faces, and wine, and music, and wit, and beauty—no wonder he hates home, and goes forth to the conflict of life without any songs in his heart or tender associations of loving mother and sisters to guard him from degradation and vicious associations.

Germany, deep-thinking and profound, did not overlook this great power, in making out her programme of national culture. All her departments of scholastic training must be interwoven with the charm and life of glorious music. How much the power of endurance of her children in brainwork—the patient research, and the vast learning for which they are celebrated, may be due to the power of this charming renovator, we cannot determine. But that their whole nation is under its influence in their social, religious, and intellectual life cannot be denied, and that in some departments of science and literature, Germany is in advance of the world, is, I believe, generally admitted.

But the question may arise: What kind of music should be introduced into our schools and colleges—vocal or instrumental? I say both, for both are essentially alike. Music is sound, and nothing but sound, turned into harmony or melody, and never was designed for aught else than to arouse and quicken our emotional nature. If this effect is produced upon the human heart, it is I think more critical than wise to contend about the *source* of the sounds, and insist that to give them a higher spirituality they must come from a human larnyx rather than the pipes of an organ.

Can we, then, under any economy of religion praise God upon the harp or organ as well as with a human voice. Certainly, if emotions of praise are awakened in our souls by the music. It is not the air forced through either human lungs or organ pipes,

Digitized by Google

that is the praise; but the emotions of love, and reverence, and tenderness that swell the heart under the quickening influence of the sound, that is the praise. If these conclusions be not correct can any man tell me why was harmonized sound added to the words? It is not pretended that the music gives us any new ideas—these are found in the *words* we sing and we can comprehend them intellectually by reading, without the singing. It is admitted I think by all, except those unfortunate persons who are absolutely songless, that the music arouses feelings in the heart, not found there before and that it gives to the brain more vivid impressions of the thoughts presented to it than could be possible without its mystic influence. It is assumed that this quickening of the brain and heart comes from the thoughts found in the words and in no part from the sound of the singing. Again we ask, if this be true why was the music added? One of two positions must be admitted, either that there is power in mere sound to arouse brain and heart into earnest, loving sympathy with God and his Christ—or that all music is an incubus in worship and ought to be abandoned. But it is assumed that *my* singing the sacred words has some power over *me* that no other music can produce. Then the consumptive whose voice refuses to sound aloud the emotions of his soul cannot worship. He listens to the sweet harmonies and melodies of the house of God and his soul is melted into love. He weeps, he prays, he rejoices, under the glorious stimulant, but if he cannot sing, he is aroused by the sound of other voices than his own—he is stimulated by the sweet sounds of praise around him. Is this acceptable praise to God who sees the melody within, though the voice is silent? Who dare say it is not? Then I ask if these emotions of praise can be aroused powerfully by means of an organ or harp, would we call the one an animal feeling and the other Spiritual? *Sound* in both cases has done the work. How are we to make the distinction, if the emotions are the same? I conclude then, that a wise *expediency*, acting under a general rather than a specific law, will allow all congregations to add that kind of music to their sacred words which will most profoundly arouse within their hearts feelings of praise and worship, and thus answer the design of the Creator in making it a means of moral elevation to his children. Nor should we feel irritated at each other for having different tastes in music. Some have unfortunately no

Digitized by Google

appreciation of music either of melody or harmony. They were born without the faculty, and therefore we may expect to find them actively opposed to that which they cannot understand.—We should sincerely sympathise with all such, and no doubt we would, if they would not insist upon giving us just such learned criticisms on music, as blind men would be apt to make on the Solar Spectrum. Some can understand only simple melody of the very plainest kind. We should not expect them to delight in those beautiful harmonies, which so entrance the soul of the more talented. Now it would be sadly inexpedient to force an organ and a choir upon a congregation largely made up of persons to whom nature has not been lavish of her musical gifts—and on the other hand it would be tyrannical and oppressive if such congregations should put a bar on their more talented brethren and insist that they must worship God in nasal tones utterly oblivious of time or tune and expect them to feel any emotions but those of disgust. "Let us be kindly affectioned one to another," and avoid using harsh epithets about that which we do not understand. Let him who delights in those wonderful conglomerates of sound called music, refresh his soul in that way and manner that suits him best, but surely all men of sense must see that it would be ludicrous to make such music or such men standards of taste. On the other hand—let not the more talented brother be hasty in his condemnation of him who cannot sing, but who can make a joyful noise to the God of his salvation, for, though generally true, it is not always so, that "the man that hath not music in himself nor is not stirred by concord of sweet sounds, is fit for treasons, stratagems and spoils; the movings of his spirit are black as night, and his affections dark as Erebus; let no such man be trusted." But of all things beware of making a bond of union of this music question. I cannot call that act by any other name than *wicked* which would rend asunder a Church of Christ on any such issue.

How wonderful is this whole question of music and its influence. How vast the range of sound over the emotional nature of man and how necessary that it should be cultivated into melodies and harmonies, which are the exponents of something within, and which tend to subdue the fierce, proud, savage spirit which finds embodiment in storms and tempests—the cry of the lonely eagle, or the tumultuous waters of the mountain torrent.

Digitized by Google

Let there be music in every department of our Universities—Music of all kinds and suited to all classes, and let the students go forth from their halls with brain and heart and voice all harmonized, and knowing from the pleasant experience of the past, that when dark days lower down upon them, and misfortune seems ready to crush them, and the cold world frown upon them, and all hopes of earth die within them, that in the music that sounds forth from the house of prayer, from the altar of warm hearts, there is a comforter that the world cannot give nor take away. E.

THE CHRISTIANITY OF THE PRESENT AND OF THE FUTURE.

BY HENRY ALFORD, DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

God is one: God is true. If God have manifested Himself in words, and also in His works, it is impossible that these two should be at variance. Now we have before us God's word and God's works: both for us to study, and understand, by His help, as we may. The search is in both cases not only one worth making, but one requiring our best faculties to make. In both cases, truth lies deep. Mere first impressions will no more guide us to the sense of the written word, than they will to the true account of the phenomenon of nature. We must dig and delve in the one, as in the other. The same sacred writer who said of the one, "How I love thy law—all the day long is my study in it," also said of the other, "The works of the Lord are great, sought out of all them that have pleasure therein." Now this being so, the attitude which becomes us is surely one of deep humility with regard to both. And what is this humility, practically interpreted? Surely, a frame of mind which should keep us from two rash procedures: 1st, from hasty adoption of crude physical theories and speculations, and 2ndly, and no less, from clinging to superficial and inadequate interpretations of the text of the Scriptures. Science properly so called, and Scripture properly understood, are perfectly safe together. The demonstrably assured discoveries of science may again render it necessary, as they have already rendered it necessary in cases universally allowed, to understand Scripture expressions otherwise than they have been

Digitized by Google

hitherto understood: to suppose them popularly used, or even to suspend our power of understanding them at all. But any such change will leave our Christian faith just where it is. Who believes his Bible the less, because "Sun, stand thou still" cannot be literally understood? And if far greater modifications of our present understanding of the sacred text have to take place in consequence of new discoveries, what single article of our Christian faith will be affected? Surely, it is not an attitude befitting one ready to be taught of God, to be timidly shrinking from the possible results of scientific enquiry, and evermore crying out that the Scriptures are in danger. Do we think that we have so completely mastered the sense of Scripture, we who know it only at a distance of nearly a score of centuries, and in a language different from its original one, that we have nothing more to learn about its interpretation? Do we suppose that the Holy Spirit who taught mankind of old, is teaching them nothing now? Because both these presumptions seem to be involved in what some of our teachers are now telling us.

Truth can take care of itself without me: and depend on it, some of the greatest eclipses Truth has ever suffered have been owing to men gathering round it, and nursing it, instead of giving it free course. I am persuaded that such procedure as that on which I have been commenting is simply suicidal; and if the Christianity of the present persists in it, we shall have the future trying to do without Christianity at all. For you cannot crush out truth—you cannot forbid research; these will go on, as earnestly, as fruitfully, as they are going on now: and if you proclaim them, what they do not proclaim themselves, hostile to Christianity, if you make an enemy of that which ought to be one of your chief friends, you will find the advance of scientific discovery too strong for a merely artificial and conventional religion. For it is free—fettered by no prsecription but the laws of thought, and knowing no limits but the universe of facts—while you, who ought to be the freemen of the spirit, are behaving as bondmen of the letter.

Nay, my friends, let us be free likewise: not afraid to follow the leading of that Holy Spirit whose office it is, throughout the ages of the Church, to lead her into all the truth; not so wedded to ourselves and our own traditional interpretations, as not to be ready to submit the one, and to surrender the other, if need be, at His bidding.

Digitized by Google

And thus we are gradually led on to another matter, in which I venture to think the Christianity of the present is hardly making due preparation for becoming the Christianity of the future. I mean, its treatment of the Holy Scriptures.

Now what does all Christianity believe about Holy Scripture? Is it not that it is a Revelation to us of the will of God? And mind, I am not now speaking of the belief of one set of Christians as distinct from that of another: I am not now speaking of the method, or the degree in which one or another holds Scripture to be a Revelation from God—but what I am saying is this; that I suppose every Christian on earth believes Scripture to be in some sense or other, a Revelation of God's will to man. If he does not, I cannot see how he can be a Christian in any sense; for he must be a follower of Christ, and Christ distinctly claimed to reveal God to us, and the record of that claim, and the substance of that concerning which it was claimed, are nowhere but in the Scriptures. Well, then, all Christians believe Scripture to be a Revelation from God. If this be so, the Scriptures must be precious to Christians in proportion to this their importance.

Now let us just examine, taking up anew considerations which I urged before in passing, what these Scriptures are, as we find them. They consist of a multitude of documents, written many ages ago, and written in lands whose language and whose habits of thought were totally diverse from our own. But God was pleased to employ those languages, and those habits of thought, to reveal His will to mankind. Well now, it is clear that we, our people generally, cannot possess this Revelation as it was given, because we do not understand its language; and that there must be, in turning it into our own totally different language, some disadvantage, both because all translation is done at a disadvantage, and because there must be many words and phrases which were then thoroughly understood, but which have lost their full significance now. It will illustrate my meaning if I say, that the Romans, Corinthians, and others to whom St. Paul wrote, must necessarily have understood his figures of speech, and taken in his arguments, far better than we can now.

Very well, what I am aiming at is this: If we are necessarily, by difference of language, and distance of time, placed at a disadvantage with regard to that which is so precious, is it not reasonable, and would not real reverence for Holy Scripture demand

Digitized by Google

it of us, that we should be most anxious to reduce that disadvantage to the least possible dimensions? Ought we not to make use from time to time, of every accession of knowledge as to the real contents and the real meaning of the sacred books, and thus to get as near as we possibly can to the actual Revelation which God has given us?

Now it is in this matter—it is because no such pains are taken in the Christianity of the present day, because it does distinctly refuse to take such pains, that I cannot but feel apprehension when I look on to the future. Here we have on the one hand, scholarship, research, enquiry, busy over these same sacred books; the original authorities for their texts have been considerably multiplied: important questions respecting the genuine reading of doubtful passages have been set at rest: the meanings of difficult sentences and expressions have been elucidated: and what is the attitude of the Churches of England? We possess an admirable version of the Scriptures, put forth, in its last authorized form, two hundred and sixty-eight years ago. Every Christian Englishman values that version as he values few other things; is jealous of having it touched; has its phrases familiar as household words. Yet every scholar who regards truth rather than popularity is constrained to confess that this version, excellent as it is, does not now, within many degrees, represent what we know of the text and the meaning of Holy Scripture.

Those who hold the very highest views with regard to the verbal inspiration of Scripture are the very persons who are the least anxious that their countrymen should possess those words which were the utterance of God. Now this is no light matter. It is very easy for us to sit still, and be assured by the opponents of Biblical revision, that all the changes which might be made would not touch one article of the Christian faith. This may be, and I believe is, perfectly true; but it has exactly nothing to do with the matter. If we are conscious that we are reading in our churches, and are sending forth to our people, an inaccurate representation of the Revelation of God to man, then it is our bounden duty to correct that inaccuracy, let the results be great or small.

But, according to the same objectors, who have two strings to their bow, the results will be great and much to be apprehended. The reliance of the English mind on the English Bible will be

Digitized by Google

shaken. Now I venture to say that the opposite will be the case. Englishmen will see, by a careful authorized revision of our version of the Scriptures, two things; first, how little in amount that is which needs change; next how much the sense and coherence of the text have gained by the change. Did the various issues of the English Bible from the Reformation to the days of James I. loosen the confidence of our people in its authority?—Was not each of these, as issued, recognised as better than its predecessor, and has not the last of them held its exclusive ground in all sections of the English Church till now? And is all this an argument against our acquiring one still better? Nay, is it not all an argument directly the other way?

But is the time ripe for such an attempt? I believe it is, at least with regard to that portion of the Scriptures which lies nearest to our belief and practice—I mean of course the New Testament. I think the day is fully come, when public opinion ought to begin to express itself in some concentrated form on this matter, and an organization should be undertaken with a view of not letting it be lost sight of.

We are operating at present under a great disadvantage as against the impugners of Scripture. All that our people ought to know, they know well, and represent it in a garbled and exaggerated light, for their purposes. The Church of Christ ought to be put in possession of all facts as to the Gospel of Christ, and not in any even the least matter, to be fighting her enemies in the dark.

And if we once begin being honest and consistent as to the one great Deposit, many other beneficial results, now out of our reach, would follow. By too many good Christians among us, anything like an intelligent study of Scripture is discouraged, and almost forbidden. With regard to anything like an appreciation of its several books, their writers, their characteristics, the comparison of one with another, the majority of our people are very inadequately informed. Certainly if English Christianity is to become the Christianity of the future, more true reverence for Scripture, and more knowledge of it, are requisites which we can not afford to neglect. Twenty-seven years ago, when I first conceived the idea of editing the Greek text of the New Testament, I received from a dear and valued friend a piece of advice which I cannot forget. It was this: "Do not point out difficulties;

Digitized by Google

pass them over and ignore them: it is not the time to be directing attention to them." My answer was, I can consent to no such procedure. As every difficulty arises, I will state nothing but the plain truth; for I am persuaded that the cause of Christ never has been and never can be served by any concealment or warping of truth, nor by any equivocation or reservation soever. And every one of the seven-and-twenty years since has confirmed this persuasion. From that time to this, as events have unfolded themselves, every bit of concealment, every stroke of tactics, every cleverly contrived plot to mask or hold back the truth, has been a loss to us: while by every concession to truth and justice, every sacrifice of the conventional for the real, in a word, by every act done on first principles and with no by-end, we may have appeared to short-sighted persons to be losers at the moment, but we have gained immensely in the end.

The spirit of our last remarks leads me to say, that our present Christianity needs more directness, more simplicity, less subjection to the cramping of precedent and the persistence in honored abuses. Great practical wants are crowding upon us, and will not bear to be left outside our door, because to admit them would oblige us to disarrange some of our furniture. Such questions as the part of the laity in our church work and government, want settling in a spirit of generous and ingenuous concession to plain demands of truth and justice; and it was simply lamentable to see the kind of action which seemed threatened, but is so now I would hope no longer, in the nascent Irish Church on this matter. The work of women in the Church, again, is a pressing question, demanding much good sense and mutual forbearance, and curbing of childish fancies, but not on this account to be put by or off for a future time.

And now let us conclude with no mistake as to what has been the spirit and tendency of these remarks.

The Christianity of this country is at the present moment on its trial. We have passed the days of mere thought and books, and we stand on the border of a time of action. What shall that action be?

It depends on the Churches of Christ in England to answer that question. God has given us Christianity for all nations, all languages, all modes of thought, all ages of man. Shall this Christianity fulfill its function over the land in the age now coming?

Digitized by Google

Now mark well the situation in which we find ourselves. Christianity cannot coerce, cannot persecute; this weapon of her sovereignty is taken from her by the law of the land. Again, she cannot prevail by railing, storming, anathematizing; this weapon is taken from her, thank God, by the growth of common sense. Persuasion is her only weapon left. And here again she is limited. We are more and more coming to days when persuasion must be sound persuasion. Time was when a well-quoted bit of Latin verse would decide a weighty matter lying altogether beside it. Nor is the day quite gone by, when a well-planted bit of banter sells at a premium which seriously disturbs the market. But it is passing. The great masters of the art of banter are not believed in as they were: men laugh and go their way; but they are beginning to laugh less with, and more at the scorner. Christianity will do well to leave off going down to the Philistines to sharpen her defensive weapons.

If Christianity is to prevail, it must be by love of truth for truth's sake, by transparent simplicity, by self-distrust and self-denial; by walking humbly and sympathizing generously; by large allowances, and boundless forgivenesses; by putting off the spirit of the world, and putting on the spirit of Christ.—*Good Words.*

IS IT A GOSPEL OF PEACE?

(From Lippincott's Magazine.)

It would be doing injustice to the excellent clergy of this country not to admit that, prior to the war of the rebellion, they were as a body very well disposed toward the cause of Peace. Perhaps, in fairness, it ought to be said that the clergy were, by professional bent, more than usually friendly—more friendly even than the mass of the community—to the ideas of good will among men and peace between nations.

So peaceful had been our national habits and conditions for more than a generation, that no class or sort of men had any interest, selfish or romantic, in the occurrence of war. The clergy of New England, especially, were overwhelmingly Whig in politics; and the course of our political history had not tended to make war a favorite theme with gentlemen of that persuasion.—

Digitized by Google

There was no reason why Federal ministers, of the type of the zealous divine who so bitterly emphasized the closing words of the annual proclamation of fasting, humiliation and prayer—"Elbridge Gerry, Governor; God save the Commonwealth of Massachusetts!'—*should* look with favor on Democratic wars, whether for conquest or defense. It was hardly to be expected that while Governor Strong was refusing to allow his militia to march, his clerical adherents would be advocating war from their pulpits, nor is it strange that the village pastors of New England restrained their instinctive admiration for the heroes of the Mexican war until they had become available Whig candidates. Whigism in those days had possession of the colleges, the reviews and the theological schools; and it was the fate of the Whig party while sometimes talking a little loudly about honor of boundary, in the main to represent, if not the Christian love of peace, at least factious opposition to war.

It would be uncharitable to suppose that the teachings of the New Testament had not also something to do with the attitude of the clergy, or that their partisan predilections were not reinforced by religious principle in their opposition to Democratic campaigns and their disapprobation of Democratic victories. The New Testament certainly contained many passages that appeared, on their face, designed to discourage strife and bloodshed, and fully justified, as a first impression, the simple belief of the Jaalem villagers, how

"Christ *went agin* war and pillage."

Such even was the tradition of the learned, and nothing had yet occurred to make the clergy review their interpretation of the Scriptures on this point, to discover that long suffering was a duty merely for the days of heathen persecution; that non-resistance was a provincial virtue, meritorious only in Judea; and that a Christ-like love and patience is perfectly compatible with walloping "my neighbor" on the slightest provocation.

But whatever may have been the public attitude or private feeling of the clergy ten years ago, it is certain that the war has pretty much spoiled our ministers. Unfortunately disposed by theological training, and by their habits of profesional thought and speech, to go to extremes upon all subjects, and to disregard conditions and degrees "on principle"—rather proud of their loyalty as a body during the rebellion, as well, perhaps,

Digitized by Google

as fond of the opportunity such causes offer for strong preaching, the clergy of the country are to-day as prone and prompt to suggestions of war and violence as any class in the community.— The writer is a pretty constant attendant upon public worship, and partly from choice and partly by the force of circumstances, has indulged in a considerable variety of ministrations, having heard, in the past five years, sermons from at least fifty pulpits and by twice that number of ministers; yet he solemnly avers that in that time he has not heard a single discourse which was devoted to the primitive Christian idea of peace, or which contained a perceptible strain of argument or appeal for international good will. And what is true in his experience he ventures to think will approve itself to the recollection of the great majority of his readers. The unquestionable fact is the clergy are the most demoralized body in the community in this respect, for they have no sympathy with the economical principles which are violated by war, while the course of the past few years has thrown them completely out of their proper moral relations to the subject.

Three incidents, not casual nor exceptional, will suffice to illustrate the present temper of too many ministers of religion.

In the year following the close of the war, a preacher distinguished in two widely separated sections of the country, made the tour of New England with a lyceum lecture upon "Our Relations with England." The writer of these lines had just returned from the field, after a tolerably good experience of the splendid parts of war, yet with a profound conviction that its evils had never been, nor could be adequately portrayed, and that enough could not be done, consistently with honor and self-respect, to avert its occurrence. In this frame of mind, it may be imagined with what anger and disgust he listened to a passionate and unreasonable harangue upon the outrages of England, in which the real wrongs we had suffered were set out with every rhetorical device, and the measures of redress were discussed with a mixture of silly brag and angry bluster. There was, to be sure, a proviso intended to save the clerical conscience. We were to talk up right smart, and press our claim for apology and damages, without any discount or delay, but of course England would not fight, and would give up everything rather than encounter us; which was, perhaps, on the whole, the most irritating and offensive form in which the matter could be put. Now, was this not a pretty

Digitized by Google

theme for a minister of the Gospel to take? and was not this a pretty way to treat it? Yet this lecture was delivered widely throughout New England; and if it called out any remonstrance from his clerical brethren or from the religious press it did not meet the writer's eyes.

For the second example, take the following choice bits of Christian philosophy and Christian morality, from the report of the remarks of an eminent doctor of divinity at the recent Presbyterian Assembly in New York. "He believed that in the present state of the world war is sometimes a direst necessity, and it must be gone through with. While the American people was drunk with the crimes of slavery, the rods of God's wrath were laid upon them; and he believed now as we had taken our dose, England ought to have hers. He believed it would serve England greatly to get a good drubbing from some one." If this is Christianity, was there not, pray, a great loss of good morals and good manners when Paganism went out of fashion?

The third instance is even more offensive. At a convention of ministers in Boston, held just prior to the outbreak of the German war, one of the officers of the American Peace Society proposed a resolution that the convention unite in prayer that God would avert hostilities and bring about a peaceful solution —not a strange suggestion surely, in an assemblage of men professing to believe in the blessings of peace and in the efficacy of prayer. It is just possible that the gentleman who offered the resolution may have been the slightest suggestion of a bore, but the cause he pleaded should have protected him from insult. As it was, the proposal was received with open and scandalous indignity by the presiding officer, who on the strength of his service as a chaplain in the army, felt called upon to vindicate the honor and usefulness of war, and did so in a speech which for bad morality could hardly be equaled. Peace was scoffed at in terms strangely unbecoming a minister of Christ, and war was exalted as the great agent of progress. The poor peacemaker, anything but blessed, was morally hustled out of the convention, and victory remained with the fighting parson.

Now it is doubtless true that, in the retrospect, we seem to see that

> "Civilization does get forrid,
> Sometimes upon a powder cart,"

Digitized by Google

but no man may know that the consequences of a war which can in any way be averted will be in any way productive of good.—He audaciously, criminally and blasphemously usurps the function of the Almighty who assumes, or acts upon the assumption, that he can make slaughter and devastation minister to human happiness and well being. War is and remains, utterly unjustifiable until it becomes actually inevitable. Nor can there be any worse condition for judging of its necessity than a readiness to accept it as something grand and heroical. The great fact is, that with the native and ineradicable combativeness of men, the conservative force is habitually too weak. Without going into a discussion of the necessity, policy or rightfulness of war under exceptional circumstances, it is certainly conclusive of the question as to the duty of the clergy, in the imminence of pendency of hostilities, that setting aside wars for territorial aggrandizement or martial glory—for which no excuse can, of course, be urged—not one in ten of wars fought honestly in the spirit of defence, and a sense of national necessity, has been approved as such by the judgment of history. The Crimean war, to take a recent example, was accepted by the English nation from a genuine belief in its necessity. No people was ever more fully persuaded—as people are of such things—that the threatening advance of a semi-barbarous power must be met and checked in the interest of civilization. Yet there is a frankness that is almost whimsical in the admission of the leading statesmen of the kingdom to-day, and especially of those who were most largely responsible, that the war was fought not only under a mistaken sense of necessity, but that the mistake was one of those for which there was at the time, no excuse; that the nation to use the phrase of an eminent fighting Premier "drifted into war;" and that it was simply from the want of an independent and vigorous resistance at home that all this loss of life and money was incurred.

If this is true, it is no less desirable from the standpoint of the statesman than of the divine, that all the influences which make for peace should be strengthened to the maximum, and the largest amount of resistance secured to the warlike impulses of administrations, of parties and of the people at large. And this cause the clergy, by an eminent fitness, and much more by a divine reason, should represent and defend. So long as one considerable body of wise and patriotic men can be found to declare for

Digitized by Google

peace, so long should the whole profession of the ministry be unanimous and earnest in the same behalf. This they should not do by a stupid iteration of texts, nor by disingenuously disparaging the occasions of dispute, nor by weakly sentimentalizing upon the horros of war; but by giving the whole force of their personal and official character, their public opportunities and private influence, to the side of moderation, conciliation and adjustment, holding and proclaiming that it is hardly possible any evil can be so grievous as the evil of war. After all, perhaps, this is only another argument why the ministry should be instructed in that science of which, at present, they know least—namely, Political Economy. No man has so little sympathy with war, or can urge so many and so strong reasons against it, as the financier; and if the schools would dock a little from their course in dogmatic theology, and instruct their students in the science which shows how it is that war taxation that grinds the faces of the poor, and war debts strengthen the hands of corrupt and wrongful power, they would better fit their charges for the work of serving the Prince of Peace in this practical and common sense age.

It will not do to say that clergymen are equally citizens with the laity, and that no duty can be charged on them which does not equally bind the conscience of all. What has been said of the responsibility of the clergy for the event of war holds true in its degree of all who bear the name of Christians. But, as there is an eminent fitness in the minister of religion presenting and urging the consideration which makes for peace, so it is a monstrous perversion of moral relation when he becomes the noisy and ill-conducted advocate of war.

I may be as hot-headed as I please, as ready to take offense, as prompt to blows, but I claim the right, as a sinful man prone to evil, to have the consecrated minister of Christ at my side, suggesting the motives of forbearance and charity, explaining away, so far as honestly may be, the occasions of dispute, and standing across my path with entreaty, persuasion and solemn warning, to prevent my wrath and wrong. At the least, I may reasonably demand that it shall not be the professional servant of the Prince of Peace who talks the loudest of "honor" in my hearing, cocks his hat the jauntiest, and is readiest with suggestions of apologies and "satisfaction."

Digitized by Google

In saying that it was the duty of the Christian minister, always and everywhere, to exert his influence to postpone and diminish the causes of offenseand to present the motives of conciliation, I do not mean that he is to keep incessantly and aimlessly rehearsing the maxims of forbearance—even the Beatitudes may become platitudes if urged without regard to circumstance or season—nor that he shall disparage injuries which are real and deep, than which nothing is more irritating; nor that he shall discuss the matter with anything less than the full spirit of a man quick, sensitive and self-respectful.

Sir Walter Scott has given a noble picture of the Swiss Landamann, who "had never bent a knee but to Heaven," suing with tears at the feet of Charles of Burgundy for "that blessed peace so dear to God, so inappreciably valuable to man." Such are the sentiments of the patriot. The Christian is bound by infinitely stronger considerations to look to every means of adjustment by turns; to conciliate to his cause every argument for peace: to welcome the earliest disposition in his adversary toward reparation; to concede all that may be conceded with safety and with honor, and that, not after the punctilious code of the duelist, or the politician's cold blooded calculations of possible danger before he suffers the dismal arbitrament of war. And this he must do not out of meanness of spirit, not because he fears the issue of arms, or is insensible to the wild attractions of battle, but in Christian compassion for those who must die and those that mourn, and in an honest horror of the waste and riot and devastation which follow in the train of armies.

A minister of the Gospel has no right to know any thing of the reason why angry claims should be made or why war should be declared. There may be such reasons but they do not appeal to him. There will be enough, and more than enough, who will be prompt and eager to resort to menace and violence. His business is to present the motives—the sacred, the urgent motives—which make for peace. There will be too few, far too few who will take heed of these in times of great excitement and irritation; and such consideration will be found none too powerful, even if ministers of religion should drop their sportsmanlike interest in the prowess of armies and the comparative merits of breech-loading muskets, and devote their time and thought to preaching "Peace on earth; good-will to men." FRANCIS A. WALKER.

Digitized by Google

"WIND OR SPIRIT—WHICH?"

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I have just arisen from the reading of your article in the Sept. No. of the Harbinger on Jno. iii. 8. I am greatly rejoiced, my dear Bro., that now the subject is fairly before the Christian public, and especially before our own brethren, and hope it may receive the most thorough investigation, and call in the most profound thought.

For more than a score of years I have steadily contended for this rendering. Have spoken much and written some on the subject. But having *mathematically* against me 385 to 1, I felt constrained to say but little through our journals on the subject; being assured all the while, however, that "wind" and not "spirit," is the true rendering of the Savior's meaning in this much-mooted passage. On my first reading the "Living Oracles,"—Campbell, McKnight and Doddridge's translation, with A. Campbell's emendations—I thought the rendering of *pneuma* "spirit," in this place, the greatest defect in what I yet think the *best* English version of the New Testament I have ever seen. And on the appearance of Lard's Review of J. B. Jeter, I determined to set the matter at rest in my own mind. I made the same induction of the use of the word in the Septuagint as Bro. Anderson, with the same results. Your course of investigation I fully endorse.—*Sense*, and not *uniformity*. Sense indeed need not be oppcsed to uniformity, but it must *never bow* to it, while it is true that *sense* and not *sound* is to be the rule.

But while, my dear brother, I deem your criticism on the *word* unanswerable, I do not think your theology at all invulnerable. I therefore call your attention in this fraternal way to some of the points in which we do not agree. I think your first mistake is in supposing a comparison to be drawn by the Savior between the *process* of the *Spirit* in his work and that of the *wind* in its operation. And because Nicodemus could not understand the latter, to forbid enquiries in the operations of the former.

You will see by an analysis of the passage that there is absolutely no comparison of *process* at all, but of *objects*. The comparison is not between the wind and the Spirit in any sense, but is in the understanding of two persons of the operations of these two agents. That is, Nicodemus—a man not begotten (I translate "*genea*" begotten here)—and a man begotten of the Spirit.

Digitized by Google

The one knows as much as the other about the origin and termination, or *whence* and *whither*, of the wind. "*Thou* hearest the sound" of the wind; so does the man begotten of the Spirit.—"*Thou* canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth"; neither can the man that is begotten of the Spirit. The comparison, then, I understand, is not between the wind and Spirit as agents, nor yet between the processes by which the agents manifest themselves, but between the capacity of two persons to understand the processes of nature; and the *whence* and *whither* of the wind is taken as an example. That this is the truth in the matter, will be apparent from the use of a few grammatical parallels: So is every book made; So is every book *that is* made.—So is every house built; So is every house *that is* built. So is every one born of the Spirit; So is every one *that is* born of the Spirit.

These are very different sentences, and convey very different significations. The former of the parallels, in each case, notes a comparison of *process;* the latter of *objects* of the process. Nicodemus is one of these objects of comparison. He is not born again. A man born again is the other object. Their knowledge of the *whence* and *whither* of the wind, the *point* of comparison, expressed by the phrase—"canst not tell." This phrase "canst not tell," is the cause of the seeming obscurity of this whole passage. But in the translation of this passage, this law of *uniformity* has done its work of mystifying. I admit it may be a literal rendering of the original, and for that very reason obscure. And especially so when used in a highly wrought metaphor. If "canst not tell" be a true predicate of a man, it must be for one of two reasons. First: Either the man is ignorant of the thing, and therefore "canst not tell" may be predicated of him; or second, He may be deficient in words or language to convey his knowledge to others. "Art thou a *master* in Israel and *knowest not* these things?" precludes the conclusion that the latter of these difficulties was in the way of this Senator of Israel. The only remaining reason therefore is the former. The whole 8th verse would then read, as I translate it, thus: "The wind blows where it pleases, and you hear the sound of it, *but you are ignorant* of whence it comes and whither it goes. So is every one that is born of the Spirit." I paraphease as follows: You misconceive me. The change I am speaking about is not a *physical* change, but a

Digitized by Google

moral, a *spiritual* change. The subject of it has no new faculties added, no old ones taken away. As a *Teacher in Israel*, you ought to have known this. My first and standing objection to the popular view, and in some respects to your view, if I understand you, is the fact that you make the Savior reprove Nicodemus for not knowing (as a master in Israel) what was *unknowable*.

Fraternally yours in Christ, A. BURNS.

MUNSON, O.

DEAR BRO. BURNS:—You see, I have taken the liberty to publish your letter, accepting the discretion which you gave me in a P. S. to consult my own judgment about it. I am not sure that I fully understand your interpretation. You say "the comparison is not of processes but of objects, ...that it is between the capacity of two persons to understand the processes of nature, and the whence and the whither of the wind is taken as an example." If you mean to say, that the object of the passage is to compare the relative capacity of Nicodemus—a man unbegotten of the Spirit—with that of a man begotten of the Spirit, and to affirm of them that they are both alike ignorant of the whence and whither of the wind—that the latter has no additional faculties by which he can understand the *processes of nature* better than the former can, —then we do not agree. A statement like this might be all true enough, but it could have no relevancy to the difficulty in the mind of Nicodemus. This difficulty was as to the 'how' of the process of regeneration. But to tell Nicodemus that a regenerated man could not understand the mystery of the wind any better than he himself could, would be to change the subject altogether, rather than to illustrate it. There had been no question raised about the relative capacity of a man begotten, and a man unbegotten, to understand a natural mystery—and why should the Savior introduce it? This appears so plain, that, though your language seems to justify my construction of it, I am constrained to think, that writing in haste, you have not clearly expressed yourself, and that I do not understand you aright.

This appears to me the more probable, since you say in another place, "The comparison is not between the wind and spirit in any sense, but is in the understanding of two persons of the operations of these two agents." Do you mean by this to say, the meaning is that as you Nicodemus—unbegotten—are ignorant

Digitized by Google

of the operations of the wind (one agent); so the man, begotten, is equally ignorant of the operations of the Spirit (the other agent)? If so, then the comparison is, after all, of processes, since it is of the relative knowledge of two persons as to the operations or processes of two different agents—the wind and the Spirit. If this be your interpretation, then again—we do not agree. The statement, that the man begotten—is as ignorant of the operations of the Spirit in his regeneration as the man—unbegotten—is of the operations of the wind in nature, appears to me to have no logical connection with the subject under consideration, which is the difficulty of Nicodemus as to the process of regeneration. It would have been quite foreign to the subject, to have said, "you do not understand the whence and the whither of the wind,—and so the regenerated man does not understand the operations of the Spirit." Admit this to have been all true, yet I cannot see its relevancy to the subject. It would have been a remark by the way, and rather a perplexing diversion, than a persuasive illustration. Nicodemus had raised no question about the *understanding* of the regenerated, but he had expressed his astonishment at the mystery of the process. How can it be? this is his trouble. But I fear I do not clearly understand your interpretation and will say no more. If I have misconceived you, then please consider all I have said as against men of straw out of my own imagination, and let them stand or fall, before my arrows, as they may be able.

With respect to my own position you say, "You (I) make the Savior reprove Nicodemus for not knowing (as a master in Israel) what was unknowable." In this you mistake me. What I intended to say was this. That the Savior intended to teach Nicodemus, that he should not marvel, and refuse to believe, because, there was to him an inscrutable mystery in the process of regeneration—since there was a mystery equally inscrutable in the whence and the whither of the wind—about which he did not marvel. If you marvel not at one, why should you marvel at the other? In both processes there is an *ultimate* origin and *tendency* that lie beyond the sphere of the knowable—as of the wind so of the Spirit. The one you accept, why stumble at the other? Marvel not, but believe.——Fraternally yours, W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

THE "MAN OF SIN."

LETTER FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

[The views about the 'Man of Sin' expressed in this letter, are not those generally received; yet it is well to hear what can be said, and what is said, against our own settled views. Our readers can compare Bro. Greenwell's opinion about the 'Man of Sin' with their own, and study both in the light of history and of the Word of God. C. L. L.]

DEAR BRO. LOOS:—I see from the Harbinger which reaches me *irregularly* that you are rather afraid of the old Papal Witch in your country. We might be here, if we did not distinguish betwixt galvanism and resurrection life. Her charms are faded, her glory is languishing, her incantations are powerless. I might be reminded that even now her Cardinals and Bishops and mighty men are crowding into the ancient City to furnish in solemn council laws for the world. Shortly amid pomps of procession, draperies of gold and purple, hymns of rapturous triumph, the attempt will be made to assume mediæval majesty and authority; but the spasms and contortions will be hideous and life will not be there. The nations who once thought that the harlot was so divinely fair, as they drank from her cup and were entangled in her shining tresses, have made their escape, one by one, the last deliverance—that of Spain—being the most wonderful. The truth may as well be spoken,—we are not in any danger from the mysterious drunken woman, for her cosmetic is washed away—her enamel is cracked—and no madam Rachel can make her beautiful again. The iron has been stricken into the heart of superstition. Her traditions are incredible, her doctrines monstrous, her licentiousness loathsome, her malignity and cruelty fiendish and revolting.

Though resting in this, I have no sympathy with those who confound the Popes or the Papacy with the Man of Sin. The theory has not a leg to stand upon. But having said so much it behooves me to assign a few reasons.

I. Holy Scripture treats of an Individual in the most emphatic language,—his pretensions, his works, his wars, his character, and his destiny. To seek him in a *series* of men—some profligate, some literary, and some devout—or to seek him in a system, is

Digitized by Google

uncalled for, unless very strong reasons can be assigned. I do not know of such.

II. The coming of the Man of Sin is to be with power, and signs, and lying wonders—after the working of Satan—not lying wonders in the sense of *sham* or semblance, but real miracles in a lying cause—the energy of hell in the cause of falsehood and impiety. That portion of the Apocalypse which treats concerning him, speaks of the great miracles by which he deceives—even the fire descending from heaven to attest his glory. I need scarcely say that the old harlot never had any miraculous power; her monkish legends of the supernatural air, being only material for merriment.

III. It is likewise clear that the Man of Sin will decisively put forth claims which the Papacy has never put forth in any authoritative statement. He will oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, shewing himself that he is God. The Papacy has always confessed the Father and the Son besides multiplying objects of homage and adoration. But there is one painted by Paul who will not only repudiate any *superior*, but who will disclaim any *rival*—giving himself out as the SOLE, THE ONLY GOD. The passage concerning him in Rev. states that "All on the earth shall worship him whose names are not written in the Book of Life."

IV. None of the Popes ever sat in the temple of God. The literal temple was burnt with fire before their unholy polity was inaugurated, and in the spiritual temple which is the body of Christ, none of them have held a session.

Paul in Thessalonians has given us authority to identify the wicked one—the man of sin and son of perdition—wish the *wilful King* of Daniel, for with very slight alteration he has quoted the words of the prophet: "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished."—(See his history in II Dan. from v. 21 to the close). Now when we examine the history of the blaspheming Royalty, we find him in strict connection with the holy land. It is there that he plants the tabernacles of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain, and it is there that he takes away the daily sacri-

Digitized by Google

foe and plants the abomination that maketh desolate, and it is there that he comes to his end with none to help him,—for the greatest one comes into the field, and the armies of the earth, and the forces of hell are useless.

VI. The Papacy is to perish by human power; the Man of Sin never perishes till the Lord is revealed from heaven. The Lord blasts or paralyzes him by the brightness of his *parousia*. Hence the historical landmark in Rev. is clear.

The ten kings hate the harlot, make her desolate, and burn her with fire,—but they transfer their allegiance, give their strength and power to a more tremendous force coming into manifestation. It is after the harlot, drunken with blood, is utterly destroyed, that the Personal Man of Sin darkens the human theatre with his blasphemous assumptions, his infernal working, his mischiefs and almost universal power.

VII. It is likewise in evidence that the followers of this wicked one who reigns as a God in the literal temple, are to perish in one damnation. They who worship him are such as have not their names written in the Book of Life. God sends them judicial blindness. They come under strong delusion that they may believe a lie—that all may be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness. Neither will this fit the Papacy, for though the system be false and vile, yet through the ages many of her followers have been eminent in devotion—living in established communion with God, and bringing forth the fruits of holiness. Some children of Rome may and will escape, but no follower of the wicked one shall escape wrath or find life in sanctuary.

Such, dear brother Loos, are a few of my reasons for rejecting what may be called the Protestant Interpretation of the Man of Sin. Protestant it may be and is, but it is neither Patristic nor Apostolic, nor in fact has it any foundations in reason or revelation. The indictment against spiritual Rome in her falsehood, uncleanness and blood, is sufficiently heavy and terrible already.

The old interpreters, from Mede to Faber, used to hunt for *ten* kingdoms, and they sometimes imagined that they found them. But it was all lost labor. They were treating Daniel's Image as if it had *only one leg*, vainly looking for the ten kingdoms in the *western* division of the Empire. Even then they failed, for it was easier at any time to find thirty or forty than to find ten. The

Digitized by Google

matter is in the *future*, not in the *past*. I think that shortly the ten kings will take shape, and do their work in the ruin of one evil force and the glorification of another. But I am looking for them on *both legs* of the World Empire. Greece and Egypt and Assyria and Palestine will have as much share in the development as the nations of Western Europe.

But, dear Bro. Loos, these considerations bring me to the point which was before my mind when I began this letter. The nations are escaping from Popery—and are passionately thirsting for Democracy. The coloring of life and splendor in which such men as Victor Hugo and Castelar paint the coming age is very wonderful. We are to have Science ascending all heights, and Philosophy going down into all deeps,—Education and Free Trade universal, Immaculate Justice, white robed Peace, and all the harmonies of the golden age. I have no desire to be a prophet of evil—would to God we had the age of Brotherhood and of Glory to-morrow or to-day. But I do not shut my eyes to facts or tendencies. I know that the leaders of modern democracy are *worse* guides than even the Priests of Rome. I know that the millions in France—Germany—Italy—Spain—who have renounced the abhorred superstition of Rome—have not come any nearer to God. As a rule they are sunk in godless deeps, wrecked on desolate shores where there is neither life nor hope, or wandering in the wilderness where there is no water. Of course the leaders of the hoary superstition have a dread responsibility in this matter, for it is the natural recoil of the human mind. From tyranny we rush into license, from Superstition we plunge into Atheism.—But when I find men dreaming of Regeneration by Science, Philosophy and Culture from which the great leaders all banish God, I am surely not going to fling my hat in the air or join in any ovation or jubilee. The rose-colors of worldly painting and even of evangelical doting are all deceptive. The imagined golden age will be only a darkened theatre where tragedies of unknown horror may be performed, and all evil things which are quickened in darkness, come into full manifestation.

I know that the leaders of Democracy and of Science and of Philosophy are thoroughly Infidel so far as the Son of God is concerned, and very few of them, even believers in the Personality of God. What sort of a voyage for humanity when the storm comes, and these are our Captains and Pilots.

Digitized by Google

In this country and on the Continent the organs of culture and advancement are nearly all enlisted in the service of unbelief,—literature, science and philosophy all driving toward the abyss. When they cry *progress* it is not necessary to stop them and ask whither are you going gentlemen? going to Paradise—or going to the Devil? for the direction is sufficiently determined, and declared.

I can scarcely finish my letter in this strain, though I know it has its use. I want to say to the brethren through you, that there is a kind of evidence of which every one of us should have a rich supply, before the tempest is unleashed. "If any man will do his will he shall *know* of the doctrine whether it be of God or whether I speak of myself." We cannot all balance historical probabilities, very few of us can compare Christianity with abstruse philosophies—we may have no time—and but small culture for the recondite—but here is a field where we can all meet, and the peasant frequently rise higher than the savant. "Christianity is a Life and a living System—try it !! Thus spake one of our Intellectual Princes and he spake wisely. We can do the will of God, and get a knowledge deeper and richer than the faith with which we began. I deem that the people of Pentecost who believed and saw the splendid evidence—that the Samaritans who heard of the Kingdom of God and were all baptized both men and women—did not in *that stage* KNOW that the doctrine was from God.—Knowledge was the rich and ripe inheritance of experience. As we in times of sorrow—trial—bereavement—and peril discover that God is faithful to all his promises and that his revelation of himself in fullness and infinity of love satisfies all our yearnings, the conviction of essential Divinity gets inwrought into the structure of life—the warp and the woof of our being. The truth of the Christian Religion is throned in the head,—beating in the heart—heaving in all the pulses of our nature—and we could as soon doubt the reality of our existence as doubt the truth of God's word or the reality of his Spirit. I have been long in writing but I will promise better things in future. Love to Bro. Pendleton and to all who are holding up a banner because of the truth.

I am, dear Bro. Loos, in the hope of eternal life—your affectionate brother, G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, 4th Dec., 1869.

Digitized by Google

DR. W. C. BUCK, D. D., OF THE BAPTIST CHURCH, ON THE PREPOSITION *EIS*.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I have read with much pleasure the discussion between yourself and Drs. Poindexter and Broaddus of the Baptist Church. Can you not publish the various articles and rejoinders written by those Baptist D. D.'s and yourself, in an extra? *

I enclose an extract from Dr. Buck's celebrated book on "*The Philosophy of Religion*," in which he sustains your position so far as "*eis*" is concerned fully.

It is true he thinks *remission* means something different from pardon or forgiveness; but as he is candid enough to admit "*that baptism is for remission of sins*," we should render to him such honor as he is entitled to.——Very respectfully,

W. H. D. CARRINGTON.

AUSTIN CITY, Texas.

EXTRACT.

"The grammatical connection of Luke 3: 3 and Mark 1: 4, is precisely the same: Βαπτισμα μετανοιας εις αφεσιν αμαρτιων—*Baptisma metanoias eis aphesin amartion*—"Baptism of repentance for the remission of sins" is a literal translation of the Greek, unless some other preposition is preferred to 'for,' as a better representation of εις *(eis)*; but the idea that 'for' has a causative meaning in this connection is perfectly fallacious. Substitute what other preposition you may in the place of for, and the difficulty still remains. Read, for instance, baptized unto remission, and the meaning is that baptism terminates in remission; and if we read baptized into re-

* These discussions have been called for so often that I owe a public apology to my many friends who have urged the matter upon me, for not sooner attending to it. I have been so constantly occupied that I have not had time to have it done hitherto; but I feel that I cannot, without discourtesy to many for whose wishes and judgment I cherish the highest regard, longer neglect it. I feel that the publication is the more called for, from the fact, that though I published both sides fully and fairly, the *Herald*, in which Dr. B.'s articles appeared, did me the injustice to allow Dr. B.'s replies to me to go to his readers without even a single *fair* and full quotation from the matter he was criticisiug, to accompany them. W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

mission, it signifies that baptism tends to and results in remission; and when we read "for remission," it scarcely means so much, '*for*' being a mere explicative showing the relation of baptism to remission. The difficulty cannot be obviated by changing the English preposition, for the reason that the difficulty is in the meaning of the word remission; but if that is rightly understood all difficulty vanishes. *If remission is equivalent to pardon, the text should read baptized unto, into, or for pardon of sins. If remission is equivalent to forgive, we should read baptized unto, into, or for forgiveness.* Let either of these readings be established as the true one, and the question is settled forever, that *baptism* is the saving ordinance. * * * * It follows, therefore, that if '*Aphesin*' in Mark 1: 4 and Luke 3: 3 is equivalent to pardon, it can mean nothing else—it cannot mean *remission* in either of these passages, and then it follows inevitably that baptism is for the pardon of sins, the erroneousness of which I hope to demonstrate."—*Phil. of Religion, by W. C. Buck, D. D., pp.* 409–411.

THE DAVENPORT DIFFICULTY.

It is well known to the brotherhood at large that an unfortunate difficulty has existed in the congregation at Davenport, Iowa, between Elder Hartzell, and the Elders of the Church and others, for more than three years past. Earnest but unavailing efforts had frequently been made to adjust it. It was finally suggested by Bro. Isaac Errett, and agreed to by the parties concerned, that the whole matter be referred, for final adjudication, to a committee of three, consisting of W. K. Pendleton, Enos Campbell and Thomas Munnell. Accordingly, the committee met in Davenport, Dec. 27, 1869. Before any steps were taken in the investigation, the following agreement was drawn up and signed:

"DAVENPORT, IA., DEC. 27, 1869.

"The undersigned having heretofore united in a request and invitation to brethren Enos Campbell, Thomas Munnell and W. K. Pendleton, to consider and settle difficulties now existing between us, do hereby solemnly pledge and bind ourselves, each singly for himself, to submit all questions of difference and alienation of Christian feeling and fellowship that may have existed between us or be in any way involved in such—whether they be of

Digitized by Google

a personal character, or of official or ecclesiastical nature—to the full and final arbitrament and adjudication of the brethren aforesaid.

"And further, we bind and oblige ourselves, each singly for himself, not only to submit to and carry out the decision as aforesaid, in good faith, ourselves, each for himself, but also to use our honest endeavor to make the same acceptable to all other persons, so far as our influence respectively extends; to the end that there be now and forever a full and conclusive adjustment of all questions that now stand in the way of our Christian fellowship and harmony.

(Signed) JONAS HARTZELL, WM. GREY, R. S. CRAIG, CHAS. LESLIE, JAS. CHALLEN, } Elders."

With this pledge to abide the decision of the committee, five full days were spent in hearing the evidence in the case, from beginning to end. That the duty of the committee was well performed and satisfactorily to all concerned, the following certificate, taken just at the close of the evidence, and before any decision was rendered, will testify:

"DAVENPORT, IA., DEC. 31st, 1869.

"This is to certify that we, the undersigned, parties in the Davenport difficulty, have had a full and impartial hearing of our respective causes; and that the Committee have been patient and candid in the investigation of this whole affair.

JONAS HARTZELL, R. S. CRAIG, WM. GRAY, CHAS. LESLIE, JAS. CHALLEN, } Elders."

The Committee being now ready to retire to write out their judgment in the case, it was suggested by one of the committee that we try to avoid a judicial decision by a settlement of the whole difficulty, on mutual agreement by the brethren themselves. We considered this would do much more to settle the feelings of all in Davenport and in other churches throughout the State, than a formal decision. This suggestion was immediately accepted. Accordingly, after considerable conference with the brethren, respectively, the following statements were agreed upon by Bro. Hartzell and the Elders and others, as mutually satisfactoy.

"DAVENPORT, IA., DEC. 31st, 1869.

"1st. In reviewing our proceedings in the case of Bro. and Sis-

Digitized by Google

ter Glaspell and Bro. Jonas Hartzell, the Elders deem it just and right to say, that inasmuch as Bro. Jonas Hartzell thinks their course in pronouncing their sentence, characterized by undue haste and without sufficient notice, they now regret that there should have been any thing to excite in his mind this opinion, or the feeling that the elders intended either any disregard of his rights or disrespect for his venerable years and distinguished services as a minister of the Lord Jesus Christ. The elders freely admit that in such cases there ought to be the most prayerful deliberation, the most sacred regard for all rights of personal explanation and vindication, and the tenderest respect for the character and feelings of all concerned; and as in some or all of these respects Bro. Hartzell feels that he was aggrieved, we tender him freely and fully our Christian and official assurance that no such purpose was in our hearts; and we sincerely regret that there was anything in our actions to lead him to such a conclusion. We ask him to accept these, our Christan assurances, as the only correction we can now make in this matter.

"2. In announcing the judgment of the Eldership in this case, we did not call for the concurrence of the congregation, as had been our usual custom. This change in our usual course had been resolved upon by the elders before this case arose, and was not made with special reference to it; but inasmuch as it had never been publicly announced to the congregation, we admit that its omission in the case of Bro. Hartzell, was a seeming discourtesy and injustice to him, which we regret. We now feel that it would have been wise and proper for us to have publicly announced this change in our usual custom in the congregation before putting it into practice; and regret that through our failure to do so, there should have been any cause of complaint to any one. We disavow any intention to take any advantage of Bro. Hartzell, and offer this public assurance of our regrets that he should have been so injured in his feelings.

"[Signed] R. S. CRAIG, WM. GRAY, Elders."

"This is to certify that the above statements of the Elders of the Church of Christ, in Davenport, are entirely satisfactory to me. [Signed] JONAS HARTZELL.

"December 31, 1869."

DAVENPORT, Dec. 31, 1869.

During a five days session with the Committee to whom the Davenport difficulty was referred, and in conference with all the parties concerned, I, Jonas Hartzell, for the first time, felt that I was before a tribunal that could so control all parties that a quiet,

Digitized by Google

candid, and impartial hearing of all the points at issue could be obtained.

After a full investigation of the whole matter, I have modified my former views in some particulars, and a sense of honor and justice compels me to present them to the brethren.

1st. I now look at my refusal to appear before the lawfully constituted officers of the Church of Christ in Davenport, because of my objection to the course I supposed they would pursue, as unjustifiable and wrong. My present conviction is, that I should have answered in person to the citation and made my demur there to the proceedings in the investigation, if I could not endorse them. Conceding this as I do, I must say my expulsion from the Church for a contempt of Court was a necessity.

2nd. In my published 'Vindication,' I held Sister Berlin and Bro. and Sister Glaspell, guilty of tattling, for bearing the news to Sister Barler that a slanderous report had been circulated about her. In the same publication it is also insinuated that Sister Berlin had falsified about said report. After a full conference with the committee of reference and all parties concerned, I now believe that Sister Berlin, and Bro. and Sister Glaspell, so far as they brought the news to the aggrieved party, Mrs. Barler, of that which might tend to injure her, did right; therefore, from my present standpoint, I do myself the honor and them the justice, to cheerfully withdraw all these charges from the parties named, for my intention through all this difficulty has constantly been to condemn the guilty and protect the innocent.

3rd. After my exclusion from the church, I honored her authority by refusing to answer many calls from various parts of the country to preach, for I deemed that an act of exclusion should always silence from preaching the minister excluded—but a committee of members of the State Missionary Convention had signified their wish that I should exercise my ministerial functions as before. I went forth to preach again. I now see that this was lending my influence to a dangerous precedent, for the Church which had excluded me had not endorsed the action of that committee, therefore it was not valid, nor could any power confer the right again but that which took it away.

4th. I always regretted the necessity which I supposed to exist for my published 'Vindication.' A calmerreflection convinces me that such publications are injurious to the cause of Christ, and if I could retrace my steps I now think it would be my duty to wait until all other means had failed before resorting to such an expedient. I desire that that publication shall be withdrawn

Digitized by Google

from circulation, and will, to the extent of my ability, recall it; for, the honor of the body of Christ should be the supreme wish of all the lovers of the Lord.

(Signed JONAS HARTZELL.

This is to certify that the foregoing statements of Bro. Jonas Hartzell are entirely satisfactory to us. (Signed.)

R. S. CRAIG, WM. GREY, Elders of the Church.

Dec. 31st, 1869.

It was Friday night, the 31st of Dec. 1869, the closing hours of the old year. Bro. Munnell was preaching in the audience room above, brethren Campbell and Pendleton, below were closing arrangements for a final settlement which was to restore peace to the Church, and to restore Bro. Hartzell to its fellowship both as a member and as a preacher of the Gospel, to which his long and ardent life has been so eminently given. Bro. Pendleton appeared upon the stand and after appropriate explanatory remarks read all the papers above inserted and commended and committed the formal reception of Bro. Hartzell to the hands of the Pastor and the Elders of the Church. A joyful song was sung, and the whole congregation came pressing forward to give Bro. Hartzell the right hand of fellowship, and after an earnest prayer upon our knees, commending us all to God and the word of his grace, we arose, and with many kind farewells and thanks to the committee, we separated in hope of meeting at last in a peaceful home on high. (Signed.)

W. K. PENDLETON,
ENOS CAMPBELL,
THOS. MUNNELL,
} Committee.

NOTICE TO PUBLISHERS.

BRO. PENDLETON:—The Harbinger is still a welcome visitor, and we wish never to part with it as long as it continues to be published. And we also desire to take all the Magazines published by the great brotherhood of Disciples. Those therefore who may read this note, and forward their respective publications to me, will receive the money due them forthwith.

Affectionately yours, W. K. BURR.

AMELIASBURG P. O., Ontario, Dominion of Canada.

Digitized by Google

DEACONS—SHOULD THE CHURCH HAVE THEM?

BRO. PENLETON:—I wish you would give your view on the Deacon's office; that is, has the Christian Church a divine right to have Deacons in the Church. Bro. John C. Miller says that the original language authorizes no such office. T. H. S.

ANSWER.

The term Deacon as an official designation was transferred to the Christian Church from the Jewish Synagogue. Therefore, to understand this office in the Church we should first consider it in the working of the Synagogue. There were usually three of this rank in every Synagogue, and their business was to collect alms for the poor, and appropriate them to the needy; they were hence called also—Almoners. These alms were gathered from three sources:—1st Two or three of the deacons went around the town with an Almon-dish (Lethmehui) every day, and collected what they could from the "world"—that is, the Gentiles.

2nd. In the Synagogue, a poor's chest (Lekupe) in which, on Sabbath days, the charitable put what they could spare for the relief of the poor Jews;—and 3d. The alms from the field or the gleanings from the corn field,—of the vintage &c.

The term Deacon in its common acceptation means simply minister; as "Minister of God," "Minister of the Gospel," "Minister of Circumcision," "Minister of the law," &c.; so that in its official sense, if it have one, we must look for its meaning, out of its simple and primary definition. An induction, then, of the cases in which it is thus employed in the Scriptures will best open to us the light of Divine truth.

We notice first, however, that it does not appear ever to have been used previous to the day of Pentecost by any writer in the New Testament in an *official* sense. The term we translate Deacon is indeed of frequent occurrence in its common signification of minister, and in New Testament usage, refers as well to the Apostles, as to ministers in the common affairs of life. Our Savior when teaching humility, says "Whoever will be great among you, let him be your *Diakonos* (minister)," Matt. 20: 26. Paul to the Romans calls the civil magistrate *Diakonos Theou* (the minister of God) Rom. xiii. 4. In Ephesians 3rd and 7th, he speaks

Digitized by Google

of himself as a "*Diakonos*," or "Minister of the Gospel to the Gentiles;" and even our Savior is called a Minister *(Diakonos)* of circumcision, Rom. 15: 9, and frequently *aliter*. In these places however, there is reference only to the performance of some specific service, without any idea of a stated office.

The first occurrence of the term in an official sense, reckoning chronologically, is in first Tim. iii. 8, 12. "The Deacons in like manner must be grave, not double tongued, not given to much wine, not persons who raise money by base methods; holding fast the secret of the faith in a pure conscience. But let these also be first proved; then let them exercise the office of the Deacon, being without blame. Let the Deacons be the husband of one wife, ruling well their children and their families. For they who have performed the office of a Deacon well, procure to themselves an excellent degree and great boldness in the faith in Christ Jesus."

In this passage it is expressly taught that this is an *office*, since the performance of his work is called the performance of the office of a Deacon; but whilst we are informed as to his religious and moral qualifications, nothing is specifically said of his duties. Before they should be called upon to enter on them, it is indeed required that they should have been first proved. They are to be men of *gravity, candor, sobriety*, and above the groveling pursuits of avarice; and at the same time noted for their sincere and conscientious adherence to the secrets of the faith. They are also to rule well their children and their families; but what they are to do as officers is not affirmed. The practical effects of a faithful discharge of their duties seems to have been the procurement of a higher *degree*, or greater influence and regard,—or, it may be, promotion to the rank of Elder; and the acquisition of great boldness in the faith; but this does not settle the question of what their duties were.

We have this term employed in its official sense in but one other place in the Scriptures (Phil. 1: 1), where it is introduced merely to show that these officers in the church at Philippi were included in the address; but while the *officer* is not elsewhere spoken of, the *office* is; and in Acts 6th, we have the most satisfactory teaching on this subject to be found in the New Testament. It reads thus: "Now, in those days the number of the disciples being multiplied there arose a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily *ministra-*

Digitized by Google

tion (diakonia). And the twelve having called the multitude of the disciples together, said, 'It is by no means agreeable that we should leave the word of God to attend tables; therefore, brethren, look out from among yourselves seven men of attested character, full of the Spirit and wisdom, whom we may set over this business. We will constantly attend to prayer and the ministry of the word.'" Accordingly they selected seven, and the apostles having prayed, *laid hands on them*, and thus appointed them over this business. This is an important passage; for although the seven are not called *Deacons*, yet the *office* they were to perform was *Diakonia* (Deaconship); as they acted, in its discharge, by a solemn official appointment, there can be no doubt of the propriety of denominating them official Deacons. Still, the specific object for which these seven were appointed is all that we are taught as to the duties of this order. This was the daily ministration, which the apostles afterwards explained to mean the waiting or attending at tables; a service peculiar to the days of a community of goods, and, therefore, no longer needed in the church in this sense. Yet, as the church still has its funds, raised by the weekly contribution, for the assistance and support of the poor, who *are always with us*, she still has need of this office, specifically for the same duty. We discover nothing here, however, nor yet in the other allusions to this officer, found in the New Testament, furnishing us with any other light upon the responsibility of the deacons. If we impose anything farther upon them, we must derive our authority for doing so, not from any thing ordained or affirmed concerning them specifically in the Scriptures, but from the general nature of the office, or meaning of the term, or else from the collateral lights that have reached us concerning the primitive usages.

If any one has found, or can discover from the Scriptures alone, that deacons in the primitive order, were ever appointed for any other duty than this one, of taking care of the destitute, by collecting and appropriating the bounty of the church for their comfort and support, we would like to see the evidence of it. We, of course, include in this duty everything necessary to its being *well performed*, and, therefore, regard the deacons of the congregation as occupying a rank of high trust; and filling a station calculated to give them great honor and influence among the brethren, and one which, as members of the kingdom, they must not

Digitized by Google

neglect to employ, by any means in their power, for the advancement of the truth, and the honor of the Lord.

In the discharge of this duty, there would, necessarily, arise cases in which *men* could not, with propriety, act, especially in a country like the East, where the social intercourse between the sexes was restricted by so many forms; and, therefore, we find that into this order females were introduced, evidently by apostolic sanction. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, 16: 1, speaks of Phœbe, as a *deaconess* of the church at Cenchrea, who had been a helper of many, especially of himself; and in the Epistle to Timothy, 3: 11, 12, we interpret him as describing their qualifications for office.

How benevolent and wise this arrangement, and how diligent and faithful ought those to be who are entrusted with the delightful charge of ministering, to the sick and needy, those comforts which the church may provide; for inasmuch as you have done it unto even the least of these my little ones, you have done it unto me! Why it is that this apostolic plan of constituting the deaconship, has been so universally neglected, by the various denominations, does not appear, we think, from the Scriptures.—Upon reformation principles, a precedent so plainly set forth in the New Testament cannot, consistently, be disregarded; and we know, that whilst some congregations may not have acted so scripturally upon this subject as the truth requires, it is generally regarded, among our brethren, as an essential element in the restoration of primitive order, to appoint in every church both deacons and deaconesses.

We may sum up what we understand to be the teaching of the Scriptures with respect to this office, in three paragraphs:

1st. Every church must have its Deacons—a plurality in all cases—and, after the analogy of the Jewish Synagogue, we think, never less than *three*—and as many more as expediency may require.

2nd. The duties of the deacons are, to collect the bounty of the church, appropriate it to the necessities of the destitute brethren, and execute whatever function may be proper and necessary to the discharge of these. This will involve a general care for the sick, and a discreet provision for the wants of all such as are needy. In the faithful and benevolent performance of these duties, the deacons procure for themselves a good degree and great

Digitized by Google

boldness in the faith. But besides this,—the most important and honorable part of the deacon's duties,—they are to serve the church in its puplic worship, ministering upon the Lord's table, attending to the current expenses, and other secular interests essential to the good order and comfort of the body. These duties,—the nature of the office, the example of the Synagogue, and the history of apostolic usage designate as incumbent upon the deacons.

3rd. Besides Deacons, every church should have Deaconesses, whose duty it is to perform such offices as cannot be so well performed by deacons, and especially such to females, as could not with delicacy and propriety be laid upon the deacons. This both Scripture and decency require. W. K. P.

QUERIES.

Bro. Pendleton:—I wish to ask you the following questions:

1. How many were there with one accord in one place on the day of Pentecost, and who were they?

2. In Acts ii. 3, to what does 'it' refer? If to tongues, why was it not written 'they'?

3. Does it necessarily follow that they were in the house when the election took place?

4. In the same chapter, 17th verse, in what manner was the Spirit poured out on all flesh?

5. In John i. 13, it appears to me that the apostle means Christ. or the Word, and not those that believe? Please give me your understanding of these questions.

May God help us all to understand and do his will, is the prayer of your brother in the one hope, W. K. E.

Colusa, Cal.

Ans. No. 1.—The general construction put upon this expression is, that it refers to those who are named in the first chapter, 13-15 verses, that is, to the Apostles and disciples, male and female, in whose presence "Peter stood up,"—a multitude in number about one hundred and twenty. I confess that to me, this is not entirely definite; the narrative seems to teach that the disciples generally, that is those who were in Jerusalem on this festal day of Pentecost, were the persons who "were all with one accord in one place." The hundred and twenty names in the first verse of

Digitized by Google

the first chapter, appear to be those who, returning from Olivet after the ascension of the Savior, continued together in prayer and supplication during the ten days that intervened before the day of Pentecost was fully come. On this day the 120 would of course be present and probably other devout disciples, who would, on this occasion be attracted to Jerusalem from the various cities of Palestine in which the Savior had taught. We suggest this as a probability; the narrative allows us to assume certainly, nothing more than the 120 named in the previous chapter.

No. 2. The pronoun "it" refers not to the tongues specifically, but to the whole appearance. The style indicates that there were not real tongues of literal fire, but that there was the appearance of such, and that *this* sat upon each of them.

No. 3. It does not necessarily follow that they were in the house, but the plain and simple construction of the narrative leaves the impression that they were. On the day of Pentecost however the probability is, they were assembled in one of the public rooms of the Temple provided for the accommodation of the people.

No. 4. The manner of pouring out the Spirit upon all flesh referred to in the 17th verse, is explained in the second and third verses preceding. "All flesh" must be understood generically, in the sense of all *classes* of persons, old and young, official and private, bond and free, male and female, without respect to class, age or condition. The full import of the prophecy quoted from Joel covers, we think, more than was fulfilled upon this occasion; it has a significance and promise yet to be realized, before that great and notable day of the Lord shall come.

No. 5. If I understand your question as to Jno. 1: 13, you wish to know of whom it is said: "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of man, but of God." You say,—It appears to you that John means Christ, or the Word, and not those that believe. The passage can scarcely mean this, since the phrase "which were born" is plural, referring to more than one. It must be construed to refer to, "As many as received him." It is a description of those who received Christ. The Apostle means to teach that the sons of God are so not by blood, nor the will of the flesh, nor the will of man, but because they are begotten of God. W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

"THESE" DISCIPLES OR THESE FISH—WHICH?

John xxi. 15—"Lovest thou me more than *these?*" These other disciples, or these things—"this fishing business"—as some are fond of explaining it? Does the construction determine?

In expanding the sentence, does τουτων (these) revert to a nominative or accusative? The unity of the expression would indicate this reading: "*Lovest thou* me—more than *thou lovest these?*" But genitives after comparatives seem more generally to revert to nominatives when the sentence is expanded. It is specially in reference to the *grammatical* difficulty that the question is asked.

T. T. H.

ANSWER.

It is generally conceded that the construction in this passage is ambiguous, allowing τουτων to refer either to *the objects loved* or the *subjects who love.* But I think this is the result of a superficial consideration of the laws of Greek syntax. Your question is a probe in the right direction. We must look to the grammatical construction for the meaning and not simply or mainly even, to the context. The latter may, indeed, afford several answers, but the former, I think will justify but one. This definiteness is found in the *genitive case.* This case has, as Dr, Harrison well states it, but *one uniform office,* namely, that of defining a preceding term or statement by introducing an object or class of objects to which specifically it is to be referred for a more exact qualification of its sense." In this example: Lovest thou me more than *these,* the "preceding statement" is the question concerning Peter's state of mind, *Lovest thou me more than.* But this is indefinite. To give a more exact qualification of its sense—the *genitive* is used to introduce the object or class of objects to which this question is to be referred, here expressed by the word "these." The state of Peter's mind is now understood to be questioned, not with respect to or in comparison with any and all imaginable other objects, but only and specifically with respect to the objects introduced by the word *these* in the genitive. With respect to these (your brethren), Peter, do you love me more than they do? We cannot make the word "these" refer to "things," "fish," or "fishing business," because these words have no affinity with the preceding statement which they shall specifically qualify—that is to say—"things," "fish," or "fishing business,"

Digitized by Google

cannot be compared in degree or kind to Peter's love for Christ. It would be absurd to say: "Lovest thou me more than these fish love me."

But the question is properly raised, may we not translate "Lovest thou me more than thou lovest these"—"fish," &c. We answer, not without a palpable disregard of the office of the genitive case. We cannot supply the words "thou lovest" after *more than*, without changing the construction from the *genitive* to the *accusative*. But the office of the accusative is entirely different from that of the genitive. The accusative, here, would mark the extent of the action of the word "love," *i. e.* the objects it reaches—and the comparison would then be between Peter's loving Christ and his loving some other object. On the contrary, "the genitive generally introduces the specific object among many possible objects to which the preceding term, whether it be the name of an object or of a quality, state, or any other substantive idea, is to be confined so as to distinguish it from the same term as related to other objects, and serve to give it a specific character and relation;" and the effect of its use in our passage is to require us to interpret the Savior as saying, "Simon, son of Jonah, dost thou ,more than these, my other disciples, love me?"

I confine myself strictly to the grammatical question which you raise, and which you very justly conceive is the first point to be settled in this and every other case of critical interpretation.—More attention to Greek grammar and less to Theology would lead us to a better understanding of the word. W. K. P.

HOCKER FEMALE COLLEGE, LEXINGTON, KY.

We refer our readers to the announcement of the Spring term of this Institution, made on the 4th page of the cover. This Institution for the education of young ladies, is a new enterprise of our brethren in Lexington, Ky., and we are gratified to learn that it has had a most successful opening. It is under the educational control of Bro. Robert Graham, recently President of the "School of Arts" in Ky. University. Brother Graham has had long and varied experience as a teacher, and holds deserved eminence for his learning, fitness to teach, power in government, and commanding personal influence over the hearts and

Digitized by Google

minds of the young. The buildings are new, and, we understand, fitted up with great comfort, taste, and convenience. These are capital points in a college for young ladies, and it is a pleasure to know, that in erecting the Hocker Female College, the latest and best improvements in college architecture, both for health and general comfort, have been introduced. The impressions and memories of college experience give color and tone to all the after life of woman, and what can be more important than that these should be in harmony with the highest achievements of science and religion. W. K. P.

LAWGIVER—CAN IT MEAN TEACHER OR SCRIBE?

Gen. 49: 8 12—"The scepter shall not depart," etc. The word rendered 'scepter,' is twice rendered *tribes* in this same chapter. May the word translated 'lawgiver,' be rendered by 'teacher' or 'scribe'? Some contend that Judah never was a lawgiver, and that the scepter had departed 500 years before Christ. As this passage is often used in our discourses concerning the coming and reign of Christ, I should be glad to see something satisfactory on it. T. T. H.

ANSWER.—We give you in answer to this inquiry, the following extract from the Commentary of Dr. Murphy, Prof. of Hebrew, Belfast:

"*The sceptre*, the staff of authority. *Shall not depart from Judah.* The tribe sceptre did not leave Judah so long as there was a remnant of the commonwealth of Israel. Long after the other tribes had lost their individuality, Judah lingered in existence and in some measure of independence; and from the return his name supplanted that of Israel or Jacob, as the common designation of the people. *Nor the lawgiver from between his feet.* This is otherwise rendered, "Nor the judicial staff from between his feet;" and it is argued that this rendering corresponds best with the phrase "between his feet," and with the parallel clause which precedes. It is not worth while contending for one against the other, as the meaning of both is precisely the same. But we have retained the English version, as the term מחקק * has only one clear

* מחקק, *lawgiver, judge, dispenser of laws.* This word occurs in six other places,—Num. xxi. 18; Deut. xxxiii. 21: Jud. v. 14; Ps. lx. 9; cviii. 9; Isa. xxxiii. 22: in five of which it clearly denotes ruler, or judge. The meaning *sceptre* is therefore doubtful.

Digitized by Google

meaning; "between the feet" may mean among his descendants or in his tribe; and the synthetic parallelism of the clauses is satisfied by the identity of meaning. Lawgiver is to be understood as judge, dispenser or administrator of law. Judah had the forerank among the tribes in the wilderness, and never altogether lost it. Nahshon the son of Amminadab, the prince of his tribe, was the ancestor of David, who was anointed as the rightful sovereign of all Israel, and in whom the throne became hereditary. The revolt of the ten tribes curtailed, but did not abolish the actual sovereignty of Rehoboam and his successors, who continued the acknowledged sovereigns till some time after the return from the captivity. From that date the whole nation was virtually absorbed in Judah, and whatever trace of self-government remained belonged to him until the birth of Jesus, who was the lineal descendant of the royal line of David and of Judah, and was the Messiah, the anointed of heaven to be king of Zion and of Israel in a far higher sense than before."

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY FOR JAN., 1870.

The sustained worth of this valuable auxiliary in our Christian literature, is attested by the very general concession that this January number, if not the best yet issued, at least, in no degree, falls behind any of its predecessors. The indefatigable editor has the art of ferreting out the best writers among us, and compelling them to do their best for his pages. Sound learning, cultivated taste, and fine sympathy with the spirit of the times and the special wants of the church in its present conflicts, are the striking characteristics of the Christian Quarterly, and they are such as cannot fail to make it a power over the minds of men.

The volume for 1869 has received the most flattering testimonials from almost all sources. Both the Editor and the Publishers have been greeted, as they deserved to be, with free and decided appreciation. The January number, now before us, gives assurance that these high encomiums on the past year, will not be forfeited by the management for its one on which it is now entering. Do not these facts warrant us in asking for the Quarterly for 1870, double the support which was given to it in 1869? It is no longer an experiment, but a steadily growing success.—The brethren have widely and almost unanimously endorsed it, as a noble and worthy agent in our great common work,—and will they not generously support the hand that in the beginning took all the risk, and won all the success of the Quarterly! We believe they surely will; and hence, brother Editor and enterprising Publishers, we give you good cheer, and our best wishes for a big *roll*.

W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$ 25	Extra Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 4
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edges - -	5
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, - -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. Va.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., FEBRUARY, 1870. [No. II.

THE CREED AND HERESY IN SCOTLAND.

Three centuries ago,—commencing with the Reformation period,—began, with doubtless good intentions, the work of creed-making by Protestants. Germany, Switzerland, France, the Lowlands, England and Scotland, all with great learning and great pains, elaborated the various reformed creeds, and these all, each for itself, claimed to be the *true* exhibition of the sum of Christian doctrine and order, and demanded absolute submission to them, both from minister and layman. On these foundations were built up the great reformed churches of the Old World.

But time has wrought a wonderful change with respect to these 'Standards.' The Bible is the same, it is still the great 'Standard' to which the believing Christian World bows as before the absolute divine law,—as 'the truth of God.' But in all these lands not one of these creeds has maintained its ground. All have 'gone to the mocker.' While they have still been professed in form and word, they have been, often long since, denied in substance and spirit. For us, especially, who have, as a people, taken the extraordinary ground of rejecting all right of human creeds, declaring them unscriptural, injurious and ineffectual, it is of interest to mark the history of these creeds, especially of them that have had a great dominion.

In the stronghold of Scotch orthodoxy, firmness and devotion, the national creed has maintained its power longer than in any

Digitized by Google

other European Protestant Church. On the continent long since the reformation creeds have fallen into helpless and hopeless decay; and even in England, the national creed has, for a good while, been, to a great extent, an effete, powerless, and disregarded instrument. The widest doctrinal divergencies, and the boldest contradictions are tolerated within its nominal control;—under its easy sway, flourish the freethinkers Colenso, and Dr. Temple of the 'Essays and Reviews,' as bishops, the former in Africa and the latter in England, and the Puseyite Romanizers. Scotland is also now demonstrating the fallaciousness of the creed notion. In a recent admirably written article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, entitled 'Heresy in Scotland,' we have a very curious and instructive lesson on the Creed question in this Old Calvinistic stronghold. The article opens thus:

"While the German rationalists are firing pistols at the clergy to emphasize their protest against State-prescribed belief, and while the Archbishop of York is prosecuting Mr. Voysey in order to recall that wandering sheep or shepherd to the limits of the fold, there has sprung up in Scotland, the land of silent and logical Calvinism, a storm of revolt against compulsory creeds. Tourists in that country must have noticed for the last month or two that every newspaper, whether of Edinburgh, Glasgow, or in the remoter provinces, has been filled, column after column, with letters discussing the "Couper-Angus heresy case." The original facts of this case are very simple. The Free Church adopts as its doctrine, without change, what are called the "Standards" of the Church of Scotland. These are chiefly comprised in a brief but abstruse manual, purporting to have been compiled for unlettered and simple folk, called the "Shorter Catechism," and at more length in the Confession of Faith of the Westminster Divines, which has been formally enacted as the law of the Church not only by her assemblies but by the Parliament."

It seems that some of the members of the Free Church and also of the others, are talking rather freely of the saving articles of faith, such as 'predestination,' and of eternal punishment, 'in a manner irreconcilable with the creed.' The attempt to bring these offenders to discipline by the Kirk Sessions has raised an unlooked for and threatening storm, that reveals the fact that the doctrines of the creed are but little respected by great numbers of the Churches of Scotland. "The propriety of the proceedings (of the Presbytery) is vehemently debated in the press.

Digitized by Google

They open up in the broadest way the question, How far the members of the Free Church, and by consequence of the Established Church (for the rights of laymen in each depend on exactly the same principles and text books), are bound to hold in absolute strictness the doctrines of the authorized creeds?"

If the 'holding of these doctrines' in 'absolute strictness,' that is, in their true, original intent, is to be demanded,—the writer goes on to say "it must make a tremendous convulsion in the whole Scottish ecclesiastical system. The 'Standards' of the Church contain propositions laid down in the most absolute and unflinching words from which clergymen and laymen now-a-days almost unanimously recoil. Of the thirty-three chapters of which the Confession consists, there is hardly one that could be now accepted in its primitive sense. Not to multiply difficulties, who among modern divines and laymen would like to stand up and say that, in the plain sense of the word, he believes that 'God created or made of nothing the world and all things therein, in six days'? That 'by the decree of God for the manifestation of his glory some men and angels are foreordained to everlasting death'? that after providing for the redemption of the elect, 'the rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sins to the praise of his glorious justice'? That the officers of the Church 'have the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, by virtue whereof they have power to retain and to remit sins, and to shut that kingdom against the impenitent'? That by the fall of Adam and Eve their descendents 'became wholly defiled in all faculties and parts of soul and body, that the guilt of this sin was imparted, and the same death in sin and corrupted nature conveyed to all their posterity,' and that 'every sin both original and actual, doth in its own nature bring guilt upon the sinner, whereby he is bound over to the wrath of God and the curse of the law, with all miseries, spiritual, temporal, and eternel'? That 'elect infants dying in infancy ey are regenerated and saved'—a tolerably broad damnation of unelect infants? or that the doctrine is 'to be detested' which pretends that 'men not professing the Christian religion can be saved by any way whatsoever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature and that law of religon they do possess'? Nor are these shocking propositions set

Digitized by Google

aside, more tacitly than such other practical injunctions as those which direct that the whole of Sunday is to be spent in the public and private exercises of devotion and in works of necessity and mercy; or that the civil power is bound to suppress all heresies, or that 'such as profess the true reformed religion should not marry with infidels, papists, or other idolaters." In short, it may be asserted that the Calvinism of the seventeenth century, is not that of the nineteenth, and that the Church of Scotland would as little enact now-a-days the Westminster Confession as the Church of England would ordain the Athanasian Creed. But in both cases there is the creed, and what is to be done with it is the difficulty."

This is a very fair and clear statement of the case, and reveals a trouble in Scotland of no small magnitude. As he says, "there is the creed, and what is to be done with it, is the difficulty." If the tenets enumerated were true and binding on the faith and consciences of men in the seventeenth century, they are true now and will be ever true. If they are not true now, they were not true then, and as they have been held as essential doctrines in the Calvinistic Church in the past, this Church has consequently held to essential errors and bound these on the consciences of men. If they are true and are yielded, the Church is faithless and apostate; if it do not yield them, the Church may be broken to pieces, and creeds cease to be effectual bonds. But the whole question has been so admirably set forth by the writer whom we have been quoting, that we will let him be heard in his own words to the end.

"In Scotland, as with us, there is one section of the Church which tries to explain away the staggering points. They say, for example, that we are not to understand days of creation as days of twenty-four hours, and that in other passages we are to give a 'reasonable construction to the words.' But then comes the inquiry, Where is the limit of construction if in one passage it is allowed to explain away the obvious sense in which the words were used? Others say that some parts of the Confession are immaterial. But to them is given the instant reply that there are no means of discriminating which points are vital and which unessential. Then again it has been said that the laity are not concerned with what only the clergy have subscribed. But besides that this is the very basis of the Coupar-Angus proceedings, it is obvious that the laity cannot respect a clergy who either believe what no one else does, or who profess a belief in which they are

Digitized by Google

consciously false. So that, on the whole, the more the matter is handled, there seems to be no escaping from the necessity of facing the inquiry, what is it that members of the Church of Scotland do believe? As difficult a question for them to frame an articulate answer to, as it would be for the Convocation of the Irish 'Church Body,' if they had to begin it anew."

* * * "How a Church is to be constituted without some form of agreement, and how such form is to be expressed, is indeed a matter of the very gravest difficulty. Men everywhere shrink from it, but sooner or later it must be faced. It will not be strange if the crisis should come first in Scotland, where the fetter of creeds is at present riveted most firmly. At least it seems certain that if it be authoritatively decreed that every member of the Scottish Church must believe what the Westminster Confession sets forth, there will be such a disruption as has never yet been seen even in that country. And beyond such a disruption who shall say what lies? Nor, even if the Church courts find means to stop the perilous examination into the obligatory character of their creeds, before a positive decision is compelled, is it possible that the thinking portion of the people, now roused to consider what it is which they and their teachers are understood to profess, should not feel driven to decide for themselves whether they will allow their liberty to be circumscribed even in form and theory within the limits of doctrines which in their consciences they repudiate?"

Here, then, is a comment,—historical,—on creeds, well worth pondering. Yes, truly, the question of the Scriptural legitimacy and practical wisdom of human creeds 'sooner or later must be faced.' We have waged a great and grand warfare in this field in this country, with results of which we need not be ashamed, with all our weaknesses and mistakes. This question is now rising up of its own accord elsewhere, and will be handled by masterly hands in other lands, and we can calmly look on and await the result. Whatever fate awaits these human creeds, one thing is certain,—the Bible will remain! C. L. L.

Who is wise? He that learns from every one. Who is powerful? He who governs his passions. Who is rich? He who is content.

A lying tongue hateth those that are afflicted by it, and a flattering mouth worketh ruin.—PROV.

Digitized by Google

THE HEBREW THEOCRACY.

DEAR BRO. LOOS:—I have been reading the history of the children of Israel, by the celebrated German Ewald, and I may as well give you my impressions while they are fresh. A few brief quotations will give the spirit of his work:

"Once in a dim and remote antiquity there must have been an extraordinary and glorious period among the Hebrews, distinguished with a halo of the most wonderful powers, purposes, and activities. To this period when at its height, with its well-known fame and sharply-defined demands, the whole people afterward continued to look back. The oldest songs of Canaan ring with the name of Sinai, as the august beginning of all the glory of the history of Jahve and his people." "All the peculiar institutions of the people—indeed the very existence and character of the community, with its spiritual truths and unusual aspirations—pointed back in the most emphatic way to a time in which had dwelt the power and the courage to institute such things, and establish them, so that they existed for many centuries. Assuredly we cannot think of this period, the results of which are so great, which gave to the nation allits glory and pride, and which determined its altogether peculiar character, and the direction of its action for many centuries—indeed for the whole of antiquity—but as one of the most extraordinary kind. The great leader of that age, and the founder of that order, who was the originator of a development so rich in consequences, may indeed have disappeared ever more and more from the recollection of posterity, hidden behind his great work, and may for a long time have been known only to the few, because he had not put himself forward but gave all the honor to his God; but it is certain, unless the very greatest thing in all history is to be ascribed to accident, that he was one of the very greatest of men and operated with wonderful powers and results." "If religion is thinking and acting under an immediate certainty of God, i. e., His being, His eternal truths, and His purposes, it is clear that every one of its truths must *seem* to the man who lives under its influence to be a word of God himself; and in uncertain, dark situations of life, everything it counsels and discloses will *seem to be* the direct counsel and revelation of God." "The prophetic office first appears giving commands, announcing in the strictest form the divine

Digitized by Google

mind and will, and limiting itself purely to this announcement. The Prophet then indeed speaks for his God and is his interpreter. At the same time, he is as his legate and general in command on earth, and where the domain of the prophetic office is widest, it is also legislative, affecting the policy of the nation, giving form to the State. It is seen in the greatest strength in Moses; but in a similar way in all the greater prophets to Elias and Elisha, and even down to Joel." "The most extraordinary efforts and noblest activities of mind striving after salvation, must have preceded the events, not simply on the part of Moses himself but also on the part of the people who followed and bravely obeyed his voice, as it called them to their deliverance. This lies in the matter itself; and that which the present accounts tell of it must be only a feeble reminiscence of those days in which the great movement of mind began. How vigorously confidence will grow and spread, so soon as a favorable air allures to the light the seeds that have been already sown! The events of that time were nothing more than the favoring wind; but because it found the most precious and fruitful seeds already sown, it soon filled the great mass of the people with the most joyful confidence in the spiritual truths."

This is a report concerning the children of Israel, by a Son of Og the king of Bashan, certainly in stature one of the Anakims, a remnant of the giants which dwelt at Ashtaroth. The report is sad and dreary, though, compared with some other accounts. Rationalism appears here in rose colors. We have here a man of decided intellectual force, a Prince among thinkers, naturally noble and reverential, filled with fine enthusiasm over his task—yet so poisoned by the atmosphere of prevalent unbelief, so drunken with the mixed wine of modern speculation, that he speaks like a man who has been foundering at sea, or too long up in a balloon. Owing to natural insight and nobility, he avoids the ground of English Deism and Wolfenbuettel Fragments. No follower of Chubb or Morgan or Reimarius. The Lawgiver and the Prophets were not wicked impostors who consciously invented the legend, and imposed it for truth. But through some causation on which our author sheds no light, there was a wonderful movement of the human mind toward God, among this special people. Impulse, aspiration, yearning, amazing activities, all centering upon God and His Kingdom, and this gradually took

Digitized by Google

the shape of miracles and laws, of revelations, statutes, and ordinances. No objective revelation or supernaturalism, but a subjective unfolding of the natural mind which made the intense inward growth project into the sensible and external. The miracles and laws and Tabernacle service *appeared* to be from God, and so deep inward convictions assumed outward shape in history and authoritative ordinances. By the way, it would have required a tremendous inward impulse to have made Moses believe that he must abandon all his grand prospects in Egypt or to have convinced him that he had conversed face to face with God in receiving the authentic documents. Equally wonderful the religious earnestness which persuaded the people that they were delivered from Egypt by a sublime series of miracles. The river of blood, the mingled hail and fire, the solemn preternatural darkness, the death of the first-born in all Egyptian houses, were surely strange deceptions. It would demand peculiar devoutness to imagine that the Red Sea was divided for them, that their clothes waxed not old in the wilderness, and that they received their constitution at Sinai amid splendors and terrors from God. The Pillar of Fire by night was surely not always seen by hundreds of thousands of people, merely in the religious consciousness. It is almost a waste of time to comment on such dregs and rinsings of unreason. To speak truth, the natural tendency of the Jewish mind was radically and powerfully in a direction *contrary* to the vision of Ewald. After stupendous miracles and the glorious outshining of God in working their deliverance from tyranny and slavery, they were still craving for the flesh-pots of Egypt. The golden calf of Aaron, the murmuring and unbelief in every stage, the fear of entering the land, the uncleanness and idolatry which followed,—all revealed a people opposed in heart and life to the high privilege and sublime destiny placed before them. The *subjective* working was evil almost continually. The wonderful activities of which our author speaks were mainly after the flesh and the devil. It was only by terrible wonders of power, and flashing of divine light and fire, combined with the sharp and severe chastisement, that they were raised somewhat higher in moral standing than their heathen neighbors.

It may be necessary for me to inform some of your readers that Ewald is one of the captains of a host who have persuaded

Digitized by Google

themselves that miracles are *impossible*. Either there is no living God, lifegiver and lawgiver, or since he created the world he has shut himself outside the circle of created things and cannot intervene. Starting from this platform to explain the Pentateuch does indeed demand a "delian diver," an inscrutable man who can read dark sentences. In fact a man of such strength even as Ewald, is lost in the history of Israel. Through want of sympathy and faith, his power is all wasted,—he is quite out of his element—as an elephant would be in the sea, or a whale in a field of clover.

Though Moses has a greatness ascribed to him in the abiding records, yet our Author's glorification of the man is simply ridiculous, and his exaltation of the Prophets, is not much better.—Doubtless God would act even as wise men do—viz.: select the best instruments he could find and fashion for the accomplish- of his purposes. But the legislation, the jurisprudence, the statutes and sanctions, the country and constitution, the tabernacle and ritual, the fountains of national life and the grounds of everlasting hope were all and entire from God. Moses and the Prophets, though not barely mechanical after the will of God possessed them, were in the first instance merely organ-pipes, through which the Spirit of God breathed or blew his divine music into the world. Hence Judaism was no growth from soil or atmosphere of Arabian desert—no development from Shemitic intellect or heart. It came from the Absolute—from the heaven of heavens—profound from the deeps of God, and energic with his divine force.

Ewald has before his mind an earnest, spiritual people, thirsting after, and ascending towards God—while in truth the people were essentially animal and carnal. What we see in the history is God descending towards the people with overshadowing wings; and such immediate revelations of power and love as might have been deemed irresistible. But the re-resistance was continual, as the history faithfully shows. Indeed, to a serious student, the conflict is the most awful thing in the Records. On one side the mingled majesty and tenderness of God—on the other the obduracy and brutal ingratitude of the people. The sunshine from the face of God, the rain and dew from favorable heavens, came down for ages on soil which yielded little more than rocks and ruins, and which—at last—for a season

Digitized by Google

was given over to the burning. The work of our Author is therefore an evil romance—a production of perverted genius and misdirected power. Starting with the monstrous assumption of "miracles impossible" he has to ignore the grand facts of the living history before him, and to create materials from his own imagination. The construction of history from the soul is building the tower of Babel. This home has no resemblance to the temple of God on the road—and it falls to pieces before it gets the roof on.

But, dear Bro. Loos, I seem to have been talking to the public, rather than to you, and it is time to return to that which is more congenial. The tumult and contradictions among peoples and sophists often leads my mind to a passage in one of those Prophets who were a mystery to our author Ewald. "There the glorious Lord will be to us a place of broad rivers and streams, wherein goeth no galley with oars, neither shall gallant ship pass thereby. For the Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our King, the Lord is our Lawgiver—He will save us." It is an exquisite painting in material and in moral loveliness. It at once charms and fills the heart and the imagination. The country of the future may and will be rich in all the elements of beauty and sublimity.—But the principal charm will be the presence of our Lord. What would the emerald valleys or the purple mountains be without Him? What would the shining river or the solemn forest be without Him? It is the Glorious Lord who will be the crowning beauty and the divine rest, when all the tumults are over. That countenance which lendeth strength to the angels, will at once be the glory of every landscape and the joy of every heart. May we be prepared for a place at his right hand where there are pleasures for evermore. With love to Bro. Pendleton and all the holy brethren whom I have not seen in the flesh, I am, dear Bro. Loos,

Your affectionate brother, G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, Dec. 13th, 1869.

THE BODY AVENGED.—By too much sitting still the body becomes unhealthy, and soon the mind. This is nature's law. She will never see her children wronged. If the mind, which rules the body, ever forgets itself so far as to trample upon its slave, the slave is not generous enough to forgive the injury; but will rise and smite its oppressor. Thus has many a monarch mind been dethroned.

Digitized by Google

'LIBERAL CALVINISM' FOR THE FREEDMEN.

The *American Presbyterian* thinks "the reunited Church might find its special mission for a national and a jubilee work among the freedmen. The church is popular with them. Their own tropic natures demand the balance-wheel of our liberal Calvinism. Our systematic training in theology has made us a teaching Church. A thousand teachers sent to the South in six months would give us the field. And we don't believe other denominations would be jealous of us for such a truly Christian and undenominational work. The world would recognize in such a movement the genuine Christian impulses actuating our reunion. The Christian people of Great Britain would be drawn to us more closely than in any other work which we might undertake. Let every other department of labor be pushed forward, but let us make the evangelization and education of the freedmen our jubilee enterprise."

We commend the above to the reflection of our brethren. It is very easy to see the great duty resting upon us all of going with the Gospel message, in the spirit of love and devotion, to the masses of the children of Africa in the South;—every religious party is talking abut it. But we should like to see a mission on a broad scale actually opened and persevered in. There is, somehow, a singular holding back,—not a total neglect, by any means,—but, as yet, an absence of any commensurate effort.—There is no manner of doubt that "the world would recognize in such a movement a genuine Christian impulse,"—because nothing could be a better proof of being truly actuated by the spirit of Christ, than preaching the Gospel to these very poor children of ignorance and degradation. In our humble opinion, however,—learning simply from the New Testament,—'these tropic natures' need precisely what all other natures of fallen humanity need, and that is not any special system of humanly-developed 'theology,' 'liberal' or otherwise, but that which is the "power of God unto salvation" to "Jew and Greek," to "bond and free," to "wise and unwise,"—and that is the "Gospel of the grace of God." This would be infinitely preferable and infinitely more effectual, than 'the balance-wheel of our liberal Calvinism,' of which the *American Presbyterian* so confidently speaks. It is really strange to hear men claiming to be enlightened evangelical

Digitized by Google

Christians, yet talking this absurd speech of denominational Ashdod. If these men mean to say that they believe and preach,—as the doctrine of Christ,—the *Gospel*, why not say so?—why talk thus absurdly about 'the balance-wheel of *our* liberal Calvinism'? Do you, gentlemen, then pretend that this is a peculiar doctrine of *yours*, and therefore not the 'common Gospel held by all evangelical Christians,'—words so current with you? If so, what right have you to go to the freedmen or to any people, and preach to them *your* peculiar 'liberal Calvinism,' instead of the Gospel, which alone Christ commanded to be preached to every creature?

Oh, this everlasting blindness and foolish pride of denominationalism! When will men speak the pure speech of Canaan?—Never, till they get rid of human creeds and sectarianism. The people, whoever they are, that have in their hearts and on their lips nothing but the simple Gospel of God, are divinely authorized to go to all men and preach it, and demand the universal acceptance of it; they that hold and speak anything else, have no such authority.

There is a point here we wish to notice. Courtesy to others, in all the ways of life, is a virtue the New Testament inculcates, and we have a very high regard for it, and regret that it is not, in religious matters, oftener and in a larger measure illustrated than it really is, on all sides, ourselves included, at home and towards others. But there is a species of courtesy often praised and demanded which we cannot honor, and therefore cannot recognize or accept for ourselves. In the superabundance of charity that sometimes breaks forth among the religious parties, it is now and then suggested that in *missionary* work, certain domestic or foreign fields shall be left to one or the other religious sect,—the others courteously agreeing to yield the ground. This charity has often been highly lauded. We cannot, candidly, have much regard for this proposed liberality, because we see no manifestation of it *at home*. 'Charity'—if such it be,—should—'begin at home'; and certainly, a charity that is unrecognized and inapplicable at home, is but a hypocritical thing abroad. If, for example, it is proposed to give up the negroes in the South to 'liberal Calvinism,'—that is, to the Presbyterian church,—why not make the same arrangements in our cities, distributing these among the various 'evangelical denominations,' so that each district or city shall belong exclusively to one of these? If division and sect-emulation is not

Digitized by Google

good in the mission fields, it is not good at home; if sect-ambition and sect-rivalry is a good thing in boreal Boston, or temperate Cincinnati, it is good also, we judge, among the 'tropic natures of the South,' in Asia and Africa, as well as in Europe and North America. Again, if these parties feel that their *sect-differences* are of no manner of consequence in the work of salvation, let them show their candor by giving them up. Either recognize the nothingness of your differences and make peace, or fight away like men for your honest convictions,—if you really believe that your differences ought to be kept up, and are worth the immense trouble, the deep bitterness and shame, and the enormous expenditures, moral and material, they have occasioned! As to these parties, finally, of course it is no business of ours how they propose to parcel the missionary land out among themselves, or otherwise extend courtesies to each other. It will not directly affect us, as we are not in that circle,—and to tell the truth, to our knowledge, no such courtesy has yet been proposed to us. If it were, we could not accept of it for several reasons;—first and especially, as we have no religious system, like that of 'liberal Calvinism,' peculiarly suited to particular colors, races, classes or latitudes; and also, because we could not possibly return the favor, by agreeing to give up certain fields to others, out of sect-complaisance.*

No! he that has the full assurance that he has 'the Gospel of the grace of God' to preach, if he be a man of clear, firm convic-

* It is proper to say, that this last position is to be understood only *theoretically*. It is often the case that, fortunately or unfortunately, the severe, strict logic of a people's or a man's position is by no means carried out into practical consequence,—sometimes it is never so carried out. Our position, as the bearers of the Gospel of Christ, *logically* is, as so often declared, expressed in the *Commission*, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature,'—ignoring any and every claim that opposes us in this, and the *logic* of this ground and claim we can never, and we trust, will never, give up. *Practically*, however, in any actual movement, or in immediate, probable, intention, we are infinitely more courteous, than any leading religious party in our land;—for outside of our own country,—a third rate island in the West Indies excepted, where the English is spoken,—we are leaving the mission field of the whole world free to any body that chooses to occupy it. As at present advised, as a people, and for reasons best known to ourselves, we intend, at home and abroad, to confine ourselves, in the in-

Digitized by Google

tions, can know of and accept no reasons that would lead him to compromise or yield up the right and duty which he has from on high, to proclaim this gospel everywhere. Every spot on this wide earth is his ground, granted and entrusted to him in solemn charge, and he recognizes no adverse right, and no equal right (we speak of course of *moral* right) on the part of any one that has not this gospel, that could induce him to give up this ground to that one. No matter what has the pre-occupation of the field,—if it be not truly New Testament Christianity in its essential elements, we cannot regard it;—*we* must, and will, preach the truth of Christ there;—we cannot do otherwise; all that is true and noble within us constrains us to do this. Such will always be the feeling and inspiration of a man of *convictions*,—who *has* a faith and is certain of the truth and worth, the authority and power, of what he believes. Such a man knows of no charity or courtesy that would induce him to yield up an inch of ground to any rival. Everywhere, joyfully, freely, and openly, we would recognize and honor, in its utmost fulness, all of New Testament truth and piety among religionists. This would be no more than just, and in full harmony with the spirit of the Divine Master and his Apostles. Moreover, all of God, in the hearts and ways of men, pre-existing,

---

terpretation of the commission, to those only who understand *English*. This may not, it is true, be in strict harmony with the exegesis in thought and spirit, of the commission as we read it in Matthew and Mark.

We felt it our duty to add this note, for the brethren's sake who are familiar with these facts, lest they should become confused as to what we could possibly mean by the bold position above taken; and also for the sake of the active religious parties around us, lest they should become alarmed at the near prospect of meeting us full armed in the mission fields of Europe, Asia, Africa, or the islands of the sea. To these we say, there is no immediate danger, as at the last General Missionary Meeting at Louisville the thought of so interpreting or carrying out the commission 'Go ye into all the world'—except so far as our country may be considered 'the world'—was never, so far as we have heard, even hinted at. This cannot always be so. Our confident faith in God, our unshaken reliance on the influence of the Gospel, and our confidence in the people of God, make us hope for a future full of enlarged missionary activity reaching out to the remotest regions of the earth. It cannot be that a people that have manifested such a prodigious power at home, will not sooner or later be stirred up to bear the Gospel with equal energy even *beyond* the wide boundaries of our own great land.

C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

is to be highly esteemed, as so much already gained in the work of God, and and on which we may often build further in the evangelical mission; but beyond this, unswerving, enduring fidelity to convictions, forbids us forever to compromise the great cause of Christ for any reason, and any plea, however highly esteemed these may be among men. We must "please," as we must "obey" God rather than man. "For if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." (Gal. 1: 10).

Finally, as to how men will judge us for this fidelity to our faith, we may always rest assured, that in enlightened, Christian lands, the serious, the wise, the noble of men, will always the more highly appreciate him who is in his life ever faithful to convictions involving his duty to God, and for which he can give strong, intelligent reasons from the Word of God, and such as men must respect though they themselves may not choose to yield to them. The 'steadfastness,' the 'boldness' of the apostles before the council made a deep impression on Gamaliel, the noblest man there, though he was very far from being a disciple of Christ himself. This is experience, and a consolation that gives no common comfort. But we have said more than we intended;—yet, perhaps, not too much. C. L. L.

POISONED AIR.

[From the Galaxy.]

Such as is the air, such be our spirits; and as our spirits, such are our humors.

If air be impure and foggy, it dejecteth the spirits, and causeth diseases by infection of the heart.

In a thick and cloudy air men are tetric, sad, and peevish; and if the western winds blow, and there be a calm, or a fair sunshine day, there is a kind of alacrity in men's minds; it cheers up men and beasts; but if it be turbulent, rough, cloudy, stormy weather, men are sad, lumpish, and much dejected, angry, waspish, dull, and melancholy. Besides, the devil many times takes his opportunity of such storms, and when the humors be stirred, he goes in with them, exagitates our spirits, and vexeth our souls.

Though stormy weather may in past times have been peculiarly favorable to the inroads and machinations of the prince of the powers of the air, we cannot doubt that in our own day he is much more likely to besiege our serenity, comfort, and health

Digitized by Google

through the still and stagnant air of our houses, and even gain access to the innermost recesses of our bedchambers. The physicians of the time of Galen knew that stagnant air was often poisoned, since he writes of that which emanates from muck hills, sinks and foul places, as being unwholesome and engendering melancholy, plagues and other diseases. The light of modern science has, it is true, illuminated many things that were obscured by darkness in those early times; but, as much is yet uncertain, in spite of the progress that has been made, we shall, in the present article, relate only what is positively known regarding the vitiation of the air of our cities and houses.

The substances that usually impart deleterious properties to the air are carbonic acid, carbonic oxide, sulphurous acid, carburetted and sulphuretted hydrogen, to which we may add the organic effluvia from plants and animals. The manner of action of these substances varies in each instance with the degree of concentration. If they are dilute, the action is slow; but there is good reason for believing that it is, at the same time, cumulative, as is the case with the emanations from lead paint. Another fact in support of this supposition is the continuation of the effect long after the inspiration of the deleterious substance has ceased. It is to many a source of surprise that minute quantities of noxious matter in the air should produce such profound results; but, when due consideration is given to the enormous extent of surface exposed by the air cells of the lungs, the wonder ceases.

Of the substances mentioned in the above list carbonic acid is one of the most important, on account of the numerous conditions under which it is evolved. Among these we may mention combustion, putrefaction, fermentation and respiration. Dr. Taylor relates a case in which an old woman lived in a room under a store in which nitric acid was kept. A carboy of the acid broke, and the fluid trickled through on the bed. It was suggested that chalk should be used to neutralize the acid; when this was done many of the persons in the room were so oppressed by the carbonic acid gas that they were obliged to leave it. The old woman returning to the apartment some time after, and remainin g for half an hour, was sought by her friends, who found her sitting in a chair unable to move, and, though every remedy was applied for her restoration, she soon died. Those who found her did not

Digitized by Google

suffer in any way from the effects of the gas; it was, therefore, dilute, and affords an instance of the action of carbonic acid as a slow poison, in a state of freedom from other gases.

Davy found that carbonic acid in the pure undiluted state was irrespirable, causing a spasmodic closure of the glottis or valve of the respiratory apparatus. The same effect takes place if air is mixed with forty per cent. of this gas. If the dilution is carried to twice its volume of air the mixture can be breathed, but soon causes giddiness and an irresistible desire to sleep. It is stated that Dr. Simpson, of Edinburgh, has used carbonic acid as an anæsthetic in the proportion of twenty parts mingled with eighty of air; but, as the mixture was employed in such a way as to allow the introduction of pure air at the same time, the proportion was in reality far less.

Berzelius says that five per cent. of carbonic acid did not act injuriously in some of his experiments, and thinks that a mixture of the gas and air in that proportion might be used in the treatment of consumption. Though it may not prove immediately fatal when diluted to this extent, such a mixture cannot be breathed for any length of time with impunity, for, according to Dr. Taylor, the air in the deep Cornish mines contains only two per cent. of this poisonous gas, yet the miners suffer seriously in health. The air of apartments is frequently very much vitiated with carbonic acid, as is exhibited in the following table, in which the atmosphere of such spaces is compared with that of the streets:

CARBONIC ACID IN 10,000 PARTS OF AIR.

London, in the open streets, average,	3.4
Paris, in the open streets, average,	4.9
Manchester, in the open streets, average,	5 4
Chancery Court, doors closed,	9.8
Chancery Court, doors open,	4.8
Chamber of Deputies, Paris,	25.0
Theatres, London,	7.6 to 32
Theatres, Paris,	23 to 43
Dwelling houses, day,	5.4 to 12.1
Library, near table, at night,	11.8
Library, near ceiling, at night,	15.6
Bed-room, at night,	28
Bed-room, at night, windows open,	8
Lodging house, London, bed-room,	100

Digitized by Google

Workhouse, London, bed-room,	125
School-rooms,	9.7 to 56
Mills and Workshops,	28 to 30
Barracks, at night,	12 to 14
Expired breath, average,	450
Room with chafing dish,	1400

The distribution of the gases in such an enclosed space as a room is also worthy of notice, since Roscoe found that in spite of the tendency of gases to diffuse into each other, and so form a uniform mixture, the air in a crowded theatre contained 27.37 of carbonic acid in 10,000 at a distance of four feet above the stage, and 34.12 per cent. at a height of thirty-four feet; the greater proportion in the upper regions being due to the ascent of the warm, vitiated air from the lungs of the audience, and from the lights used for the purpose of illumination.

The effects of the action of moderately-dilute carbonic acid are great weight in the head, ringing in the ears, pain in the temples, a tickling or pungent sensation in the nose, and loss of control over the muscular system, the limbs being usually relaxed, but sometimes convulsed. Respiration is difficult at first, then snoring or stertorous, and finally suspended entirely. The action of the heart is at first violent, but gradually diminishes, and finally ceases. The cerebral or brain symptoms are sometimes pleasant and sometimes painful. Gueraud thinks carbonic acid is much more noxious if carbonic oxide is also present, and that a quantity of either gas that would be harmless alone is dangerous when mingled with the other.

Carbonic oxide is ordinarily produced by slow combustions, or by a deficiency in the supply of atmospheric air. It is combustible, and may at any time be seen burning with a pale blue flame over an anthracite fire that has been recently replenished. It sometimes passes under the name of charcoal vapor; but it must be remembered that the gas arising from burning charcoal is not pure carbonic oxide, but a mixture of that gas with carbonic acid. So poisonous is this mixture, that Leblanc states that if half a per cent. of carbonic oxide is mingled with air containing five per cent. of carbonic acid it soon proves fatal, and Letheby found that the same percentage of pure carbonic oxide killed small birds in three minutes.

In cases of poisoning by carbonic oxide the fatal result has

Digitized by Google

nearly always been produced by charcoal vapor that has been evolved in the apartment. One curious case is recorded in which the gas from a charcoal stove in an upper room passed downward through a flue into the room underneath, where a man and his wife slept, destroying the life of the woman and nearly killing the man. The tendency of this gas to accumulate in the system when in a very dilute state, and so cause death, is illustrated by an instance in which a brazier with ignited charcoal was placed for a short time in a prison cell and then removed. The prisoners went to sleep, and two died, though the survivors declared that they had no recollection of any unpleasant effects from the presence of the gas.

The action of carbonic oxide and of carbonic acid on the blood is very different. The first reddens or brightens it, while the latter darkens it. Bernard states that this brightening of the color of the blood by carbonic oxide remains for two or three weeks, thus accounting for its accumulating action, and he surmises that its poisonous property is due to the changes it produces in the blood discs, whereby their ability to absorb oxygen from the air is destroyed. The symptoms it causes are similar to those of a narcotic poison, the animals subjected to it falling insensible and dying quickly without a struggle. It also seems to have a specific action on the voluntary muscles; hence the usual absence of any attempt on the part of the sufferer to escape its deadly effect.

When air is vitiated by this gas the usual test of a lighted candle fails to give satisfaction, for an atmosphere containing five or six per cent. of carbonic oxide, is rapidly fatal to life, but producing very little effect on a flame. Even in the case of carbonic acid, the candle-flame test is not absolutely reliable, for a candle will burn in an atmosphere that would not support life. It therefore follows that this test is only worthy of absolute reliance when the flame is extinguished, for under these circumstances the gas would certainly be fatal to life. If the candle burns, it does not necessarily follow that a person may enter the suspected chamber or cavity with impunity; and if there is any reason for suspicion ropes should always be attached to the one who first enters, so that, in case he is affected by the poisonous gas, he may be rapidly removed without danger to others who may attempt to rescue him.

Sulphurous acid is evolved in the combustion of coke, or any coal that contains such compounds of sulphur as the different

Digitized by Google

kinds of pyrites. It is very irritating to the respiratory apparatus, as any one may satisfy himsef by inhaling the fumes arising from a recently-ignited lucifer match. This property usually prevents it from causing fatal results, since it gives warning of its presence. Accidents from breathing sulphurous acid are consequently rare, yet they do sometimes occur, as is shown by the vital statistics of different countries. In the Guy Hospital reports an instance is related in which some sailors went to sleep in the forecastle of a coal brig, having made a fire in a stove with coal rich in pyrites. While they were asleep some person on deck covered the mouth of the pipe or flue on the outside, and a few hours afterward the unfortunates in the forecastle were found in a dying state, being insensible and frothing at the mouth, and two expired in spite of all efforts made in their behalf.

The important question of the vitiation of the air in tunnels on railways, is intimately connected with the consideration of the effects of sulphurous acid on the system, since the products of the combustion of ordinary anthracite and of coke are the three gases we have thus far examined, namely: carbonic acid, carbonic oxide and sulphurous acid. One of the best examples of such vitiated air is afforded by the Metropolitan Underground railway in London, regarding which the "Athenæum" remarks: "The attention of whatever authorities may exist for the control and direction railways, must be earnestly invoked to the frightful state of the atmosphere—we beg pardon for misusing the term—in the Metropolitan Railway tunnels. Several persons died in these shamefully neglected passages during last summer; and if one is to look at the present state of the line they died in vain. Something was done or said to have been done, and scientific witnesses of great distinction distinguished themselves by reassuring the public mind as to the salubrity or the tunnels. The company produced their own servants in such blooming health that some folks were expected to reside permanently in their carriages or cars 'for the benefit of the air.' Still, however, in the worst part of the railway, *i. e.*, from King's Cross to Baker street, the heat is often so great that perspiration streams over traveller's faces, and the effect of the want of ventilation is so painful that scores drag themselves faintly up the steps at the stations."

In the chemical examinations which were made in the inquests in cases of death occurring in the railway carriages, or at the sta-

Digitized by Google

tions, the testimony demonstrated that, while the air in the London streets contained four parts in ten thousand of carbonic acid, that in the tunnels often contained nearly twenty. At the same time there was a diminution in the amount of oxygen, from 21.95 per cent. in the streets, to an average of 20.17 in the tunnels, and in one instance to 18.07 per cent. The air was, therefore, not only vitiated by the addition of a large amount of carbonic acid, but it was also subjected to deterioration by the abstraction of oxygen, and in this respect was worse than that of the deepest mines in England, in which the average of many hundred examinations gave 20.26 per cent. of oxygen.

As regards the amount of sulphurous acid, the evidence was conflicting. While Letheby stated that it was less than one in 100,000, Rodgers found 1 in 24,000; and the former supported his opinion by showing that in the proportion of 1 of gas in 100,000 of air, sulphurous acid would cause coughing, while the atmosphere of the tunnel did not produce that effect. It was also shown that the quantity was greatest at 4 P. M. while the traffic was greatest. In foul or dense weather there was also a marked tendency to the accumulation of this gas.

The continued and loud complaints of the travelling public regarding the irritating effects of sulphurous acid gas directed the attention of the managers of the railway more especially to this objectionable product, and the greatest care is taken to remove the sulphur from the coke employed in the locomotives. The evolution of the products of combustion in the tunnels is also avoided, as much as possible, by shutting off the air from the fire when passing through them, and generating the steam almost entirely in the open spaces. Much as these precautions may have aided in improving the general state of the air in these underground passages, the results are not as satisfactory as might be desired, for complaint is still made regarding the condition of the air. The great difficulty still remains that, though the general atmosphere of the tunnel may be sufficiently pure, the traveller from time to time is assaulted by a rush of foul air that has come almost directly from the funnel of the locomotive, and is, of course, laden with the products of combustion. The very precautions that have been taken to reduce the quantity of these by partially cutting off the access of air to the fire, has rendered them more dangerous by the substitution of carbonic oxide

Digitized by Google

for carbonic acid. In view of these considerations, it would appear that the proper device for avoiding these evil consequences would be to conduct the products of combustion as completely as possible to the rear of the train by means of suitable tubes or other contrivances. It has been suggested that the engine might deliver smoke under the train, but it would seem that but little is to be gained by this, as the heated gases would rise at once and ultimately produce more harm than good, for the train would at all times be bathed in an atmosphere of the products of combustion that would pass up the sides of the cars or carriages, and enter them by the windows.

The coal gas used for the purposes of illumination is composed of carburetted hydrog n and hydrogen, in addition to the substances we have studied. Its noxious effects are well known, and are attributed by some to the naphtha compounds it usually contains; others think that they are due to the carburetted hydrogen, while many think that they are produced by carbonic oxide, which is often found in considerable quantities, as is shown by the following analysis:

COAL GAS.

Hydrogen,	464.3
Carburetted hydrogen	389.3
Carbonic oxide,	56.2
Olefiant gas,	38.6
Vapor of water,	24.8
Nitrogen,	22.2
Carbonic acid,	4.6
	1000.0

The symptoms produced by the inhalation of coal gas are giddiness, headache, nausea, vomiting, and stupor. It has proved fatal when present in as small a proportion as ten per cent. Death is sometimes very sudden, as in the case of a gas-fitter who was making repairs on a pipe in a closet, and died in the attitude in which he had been working while sitting on the top of a step-ladder.

Sulphuretted hydrogen is more noxious than any of the preceding gases; in its pure state it kills instantly; and though its offensive odor usually gives warning of its presence, there is good reason for believing that, even when so dilute as not to be readily appreciated by the senses, it is still very dangerous. It is not even necessary that it should be introduced into the lungs in or-

Digitized by Google

der to produce a fatal result, for it will act by absorption through the skin, as is shown by the experiments of Donovan, in which a rabbit was enclosed in a vessel of the gas, and, though the head was uncovered so that it could breathe pure air, it died in ten minutes.

The smallest proportion of sulphuretted hydrogen that will kill speedily is probably six to eight per cent., but this is by no means certain, for rats will live in sewers in which the air is contaminated to that extent. Small quantities may, it is true, be breathed for a short time without injury, but if the introduction is persisted in it is very dangerous, as was the case with the workmen in the Thames Tunnel, all of whom suffered severely from prolonged exposure to this gas in a highly diluted state, many of the most robust being reduced in health and some even losing their lives.

While the other noxious gases are usually the product of combustion, and their origin therefore apparent, sulphuretted hydrogen obtains an entrance into our houses in a surreptitious and insiduous manner through the waste pipes of sinks and wash basins, the latter giving it access even to our bed rooms. There can be but little doubt that the prolonged nausea from which some persons suffer, and which often terminates in confirmed dyspepsia, is not unfrequently due to this cause, and while the sufferer and the physicians are searching in vain for some means of relief, and are experimenting with various remedies, the true origin of the trouble is unsuspected and might be easily removed by a proper attention to the waste-pipe traps. The test by which the presence of this gas in the air of a room may be detected is very simple. It may be performed by taking the white unprinted margin of a newspaper, moistening it with a solution of sugar of lead, and suspending the prepared slips of paper in the locality to be examined. If the air contains sulphuretted hydrogen the slips darken and finally become black, the rapidity with which the change occurs giving data for forming an estimate of the amount of gas.—The air of the apartment may at the same time be compared with that of the streets by suspending another slip of leaded paper outside of one of the windows in such a position that it may be in the shade at all times.

The physiological effects of sulphuretted hydrogen vary with the degree of concentration. If it is strong it acts like a narcot-

Digitized by Google

ic and the person soon faints, but may be restored if removed at once into the fresh air, and treated with stimulants and the cold water douche. There is always more or less nausea, even though the gas may be very dilute. Its poisonous effect is doubtless due in all cases to its absorption by the blood, and subsequent action on the iron of the discs, whereby the fluid loses its red color and becomes black, the variation in the symptoms being dependent on the rapidity with which these results are produced.

Regarding the organic emanations or effluvia escaping from animals and plants, we have but little accurate knowledge. It is, however, well known that vaporous organic compounds are voided both by the skin and respiratory apparatus in man; of this we may readily satisfy the most incredulous by referring to the well-known fact that these exhalations often possess a peculiar and disagreeable odor other than that of sulphuretted hydrogen; and in the case of the breath, we can demonstrate the presence of volatile organic bodies by their action on sulphuric acid or on a solution of permanganate of potassa. So noxious are these human effluvia, that there is good reason for believing that in the instances where life has been sacrificed by the crowding of a number of persons in a small space, the fatal termination has resulted from their action rather than from that of the carbonic acid or sulphuretted hydrogen exhaled. This hypothesis receives the strongest support from the fact that in such cases the survivors have nearly always passed through a serious attack of putrid fever before they finally recovered.

The chief difficulty in the removal of these noxious organic ingredients from the rooms in which they are being continually evolved is owing to the fact that they have a powerful tendency to attach themselves to the walls and floors. So strong is this attachment that nothing short of a complete renewal of the plastering and flooring suffices for their destruction; and in hospitals and tenement houses, where the wards and apartments are always crowded, this should be done at intervals of a few years, if it is desired to give the occupants a fair chance to live out their allotted time.

Though the air is dependent for the renewal of its oxygen on the action of the green leaves of plants, it must not be forgotten that it is only in the presence and under the stimulus of light that these organisms decompose carbonic acid. All plants, irrespective

Digitized by Google

of their kind or nature, absorb oxygen and inhale carbonic acid in the dark. The quantity of noxious gas thus eliminated is, however, exceedingly small when compared with the oxygen thrown out during the day. When they are flowering, plants exhale carbonic acid in considerable quantity, and at the same time evolve heat. In this condition, therefore, they resemble animals as regards their relation to the air; and a number of plants placed in a room would, under these circumstances, tend to vitiate the air.

While the phanerogamia, or flowering plants, depend on the air almost entirely for their supply of carbon, and are busy during the day in restoring to it the oxygen that has been removed by animals, many of the inferior cryptogamia, as the fungi and parasitic plants, obtain their nourishment from material that has already been organized. They do not absorb carbonic acid, but on the contrary they act like animals, absorbing oxygen and exhaling carbonic acid at all times. It is, therefore, evident that their presence in a room cannot be productive of good results.

Aside from the highly deleterious action that plants may exert on the atmosphere of a sleeping-room, by increasing the proportion of carbonic acid during the night, there is another and more important objection to be urged against their presence in such apartments. Like animals, they exhale peculiar volatile organic principles, which in many instances render the air unfit for the purposes of respiration. Even in the days of Andronicus this fact was recognized, for he says, in speaking of Arabia Felix, that "by reason of myrrh, frankincense and hot spices there growing, the air was so obnoxious to their brains, that the very inhabitants sometimes cannot avoid its influence." What the influence on the brains of the inhabitants may have been does not at present interest us: we have only quoted the statement to show that long ago the emanations from plants were regarded as having an influence on the condition of the air; and, in view of our present ignorance, it would be wise to banish them from our sleeping apartments, at least until we are better infomed regarding their true properties. JNO. C. DRAPER.

The righteousness of the perfect shall direct his way: but the wicked shall fall by their own wickedness.

Digitized by Google

THE HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF CHRISTOLOGY.

A LECTURE.

In determining the hypostatical distinctions of the Trinity, the Fathers could not fail to encounter the question concerning the person, Christ. The question of our Savior to Peter, "Who do men say that I the Son of man am?" must not only have its *faith*-answer, but its *scientific* answer. The doctrine of Christ is styled technically, Christology. This word, which seems to have been introduced into our language in the 17th century (perhaps by Dr. Th. Jackson), was so well suited to express the subject of Christ's nature and person, that it soon came into free scientific use. In 1705, Fleming entitled his work on this subject, published in London, Christology. Owen called his treatise on the person of Christ Χριστολογια, about the beginning of the present century, and the great work of Hengstenberg, made familiar to the English world now for some 15 years by the translation of Meyer, is also entitled Christology. Etymologically, as you know, it means a Discourse about Christ, but it turns especially to the question of his incarnation—and his nature, as at once the Son of man and the Son of God.

The fathers of the primitive church "regarded the incarnation of the God-man as a manifestation of the free grace of God, as the most glorious of all revelations and developments, and as the perfection and crown of creation, rather than as the mere effect of the sin of man." Hag. i. p. 176. It was necessary as the full manifestation of God, and glorious perfection of man. Irenæus says Christ both *perfected* and *restored* the nature of man. He is the ανακεφαλαιωσις, in whom God gathers together in one all things (Eph i. 10). "The repetition, renovation and restitution of that which formerly existed, the reunion of that which was separated, the essence of all that is human in its highest significance—both the sum total and the renovation of mankind—the new Adam. He says: "Jesus Christus, Dominus noster, propter immensam suam dilectionem factum est quod sumus nos, uti nos perficeret esse, quod est ipse." "Jesus Christ, our Lord, on account of his great love, became what we are, that we might attain to be what he is." These were the views also of the Alexandrian school.

But Tertullian thought his incarnation had only reference to

Digitized by Google

his later sufferings; and Cyprian regards it as not so much on account of the sin of Adam, as because of the disobedience of his descendants, whom former revelations had failed to reform. But this is a view looking to the design and effect of his coming, which we postpone for later consideration, after we have first presented to you the subject of his nature and person.

We do not find the relation in which the divine and human natures of Christ stand to one another, very definitely stated in the writings of the Primitive Fathers. There is indeed allusion to the intimate connection between them, but the part that either takes in the composition of the God-man is not scientifically thought out or expressed. The question was so involved in the discussion of the Trinity, that the one could not be dogmatically stated until the other was settled.

Pliny, in speaking of the primitive Christians, says, "They sing a song to Christ as to God," and the usual doxologies in use in this age, as well as the baptismal formula and the institution of Christian festivals, show that divine homage was paid to Christ by the primitive church. But on the other hand, Justin Martyr and Origen appeal to his superior wisdom, often, as though his divinity consisted in it. The superior excellency of his doctrine—his transcendent human wisdom—these, says Justin Martyr, are enough to secure to him the predicate, "son of God," even though he were nothing more than a mere man. But he adds, "he is more than this." But in what, and how more, is not stated. Origen reasons like Dr. Channing, or shall I not rather say, that Dr. Channing reasons like Origen. He points to the extraordinary personal character of Jesus as the bloom and crown of humanity. Comparing him with the worshiped philosophers, he says, "Jesus, the meanest and humblest of all Seriphii, yet caused a greater commotion in the world than Themistocles, or Pythagoras, or Plato, yea than any wise man, prince or general." Others may have distinguished themselves by particular displays of greatness, but he unites in himself in peerless perfection, all excellencies. Others may have been gifted with wonderful genius—Jesus is the miracle of the world!

Minucius Felix does not rise above the negative view—that is, that "Jesus is more than a mere man." This was felt and argued in a practical way and had a firm hold in the faith of the primitive Christians. If they had not thought out the problem,

Digitized by Google

they had solved it in their hearts, and clung to Jesus as alone having eternal life. They said; "Verily is he miserable whose whole hope is placed in a mortal man, for when he himself perishes, all his power to aid us perishes with him." Or with Novatian, "If Christ be only a man, why is any hope placed in him, since hope in a man is accursed."

In the controversies with heretics, both the humanity and divinity were sharply and unequivocally insisted on. Thus the Ebionites and Artemonites insisted that Jesus was only the son of Joseph and Mary. Against these Justin Martyr contends that Christ is not a man born like common men of both parents, but only of the Virgin. On the other hand, he equally insisted upon his humanity against the Gnostics, who denied this nature to him altogether. The opinion was maintained by Cerinthus and Basilides, that the Logos, by which they meant Christ, descended upon the man Jesus at his baptism;— Marcion taught that Christ appeared as Deus ex machina,—and Valentinus, admitting the phenomenon of the birth of Mary, denied that she was anything more than a channel of transition into the world—she imparted no nature to Christ. These are all gross attempts at explanation of the mystery of the incarnation, which were met at this time by dogmatic opposition, and which became afterwards, with other forms of heresy, the occasions of a more thorough analysis and synthesis of the teachings of revelation on this subject. For the present it was written, ὁ λογος σαρξ εγενετο, "The word became flesh," and in this the popular faith rested—waiting for the doctrinal solution yet to come.

Whether the soul of Jesus formed a part of his humanity, was a question, which, perhaps, but few, before the time of Origen, (save perhaps Irenæus and Tertullian,) felt prepared definitely to answer. Justyn Martyr thought that Jesus had no νους or human soul—this had been replaced by the λογος, so that he was composed of λογος, ψυχη & σωμα. Concerning his body, the Alexandrian school advocated views nigh akin to those of the Docetæ, who taught that the Savior had no real material body, but only a *seeming* one (δωκεω to seem), assumed for sensible manifestation, but having no substantive reality. Clement, for example, contended that the body of Jesus was not subject to the accidents of the material world, with the same physical necessity of common human bodies. It is true that he denounces the Docetæ as heretics, affirming against them

Digitized by Google

that Jesus ate and drank like other men, yet he regards this as a mere accommodation to human nature, and regards it as ridiculous to think, that these material nourishments were necessary to him, as to other men, maintaining that his body was sustained by a Divine power, and not by material food. He admits that his body was bruised and died, but then his sufferings were only apparent, that even on the cross he really felt no pains. His body was a manifestation, elevated far above ordinary human organizations, revealing a beauty, not of the flesh, captivating to the senses, but a beauty of the soul, and the true beauty of the body, viz., immortality. But of all this we can make but little more than a phantom body, and in its last analysis, the doctrine of Clement can scarcely be distinguished from that of the more moderate Docetism, which he condemned. It was a virtual denial of a true humanity.

Origen taught that the body of Jesus was not equally manifested to all persons, nor at all times. "All who see Christ," says he, "are not equally illuminated by him, but that each one is illuminated according to the measure of his ability to receive the force of his light. And as the eyes of the body are not always equally illuminated by the sun, but as each one, according as he shall ascend to a higher point, and contemplate his rising by the vision of a more elevated position, has a correspondingly more ample perception of the force of his splendor and heat,—so also the mind, as it is more lofty and noble, approaches nearer to Christ, and brings itself into closer contact with the splendor of his light, and by so much, is more magnificently and gloriously irradiated by his light." In this way, he explains the transfiguration on the mount, clearly implying that the person or body of Christ was only a mode of manifesting himself, which varied with the spiritual state or condition of the beholder. Still, Origen held explicitly to his having a true human soul. He says, "The Son of God wishing to appear to men and to dwell among men, took not only a human body, as some think, but also a soul *(animam)*, in nature, indeed, like to our souls, but in purpose and virtue, like himself." He says, two errors should be guarded against, (1) that of excluding the Logos from Christ, as if the eternal Logos and the historic Christ were two distinct, separate individuals; (2) that of confounding the former with the latter, the eternal Logos with the historical Christ, as if he did not ex-

Digitized by Google

ist apart from him." The Father is the light as such, the Son is the light which shines in darkness; but the humanity of Christ ceased to exist after his ascension. Tunc homo fuit, nunc autem homo esse capavit.

Thus the doctrine was steadily settling in these controversies against the notions of Docetism, and the human nature of Christ was becoming a recognized item of orthodoxy. The extreme sensitiveness of the trinitarians with reference to the essential divinity of Christ, had stood in the way, however, of a precise definition of the relation which the human nature sustained to the divine. That the Son was of one essence with the Father, must be guarded against all question or modification, and how to harmonize this also with his perfect humanity, did not appear so evident; hence the question was naturally kept in the back ground of polemics.

Hilary, therefore, still contended that "the body of Jesus could not undergo any real sufferings." He seeks to preserve, however, the most intimate union between the divine and human natures of Christ, so that it may be said, that "he is wholly the son of man and the Son of God, and *vice versa*," and for the same reason says concerning the God-man, "Having indeed a body capable of suffering and that suffered, yet he had no nature for pain." As water suffers the arrow to pass through it, yet closes behind it without a wound, so with the body of Christ. "Therefore he took infirmities, because he was born a man; and he is thought to feel *(dolere)* pain, because he suffers *(patitur)*, but truly he was without pain *(doloribus)*, because he was God."

Notwithstanding all this, Hilary ascribed a human soul to Christ, but it was one originating in himself, and not received or derived from Mary.

There were still two other questions involved in the full scientific determination of the natures and person of Christ. (1) It was asked, "Whether a human soul formed a necessary part of the Humanity of Christ; and if so, (2) Was this soul to be understood as only the animal soul, or as both the animal soul and the rational spirit of man (in distinction from the Spirit of God)?—The orthodox party already held the affirmative of the first of these two questions, as against the Arians. The latter was still indefinitely floating in the whirls of polemics. The Apollinarian controversy served to call out nicer and clearer distinctions, and

Digitized by Google

thus to facilitate the full development of the difficult subject. Apollinarius was Bishop of Laodicea, and not only reckoned among the orthodox, but was honored for distinguished service in the church. On this subject, however, he took the ground that "Christ had no need of a rational soul, because the divine nature was competent to all the rational and free acts which the Savior performed; and he could see no good reason why Christ must have had *two* intelligent natures and two free wills. He supposed further, that a rational human soul, as being the seat of sinful acts, must be liable to moral changes, and therefore, that Christ, if he had possessed a rational human soul, could not have had an unchangeable, that is, a sinless human nature."—(Mos. i. p. 302 n. 52.) This view of Apollinarius was supposed to involve Patripassianism. It was zealously opposed by Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, and Gregory of Nyssa.

Athanasius replied, that it behooved Christ to be our example in all things and in every respect, and that his nature therefore must resemble ours. Sinfulness, he contended, is not a necessary attribute of man, having been superinduced by his own act. On the contrary, he was originally free from sin—and that the purpose of Christ's appearing was to show that God is not the author of sin, by exhibiting and exemplifying the possibility of a perfectly sinless life. He distinctly separated the divine from the human nature, but did not admit that he taught the doctrine of two Christs. Gregory of Nazianzum also asserted the necessity of a true and perfect human nature—Jesus could redeem and sanctify man only by assuming his whole nature, body and soul. (We must distinguish in Christ αλλο και αλλο but not αλλος και αλλος.)

This doctrine of Apollinarius, thus opposed, was finally brought before the Council of Constantinople, the second General Council (A. D. 331) and was there pronounced heretical.

The human and the divine nature being thus declared necessary in the Christ, the question arose in what sense the historical life of Christ was related to each. Did his actions, as phenominally exhibited and as narrated in the Gospels, relate to his human nature only, or to both his human and Divine natures? His birth, his sufferings, his death,—were these to be referred to his human nature only, or, also to his Divine nature? And if to the latter, as well as to the former, in what sense to the latter? The

Digitized by Google

Theologians of the Alexandrian school admitted that Christ had both natures, and each in absolute fullness and *unity;* but Diodorus of Tarsus and Theodore of Mapsuestia, strictly distinguished the one from the other. "We adore the purple," says Diodorus, "for the sake of him who is clothed with it, and the temple, for the sake of him who inhabits it"—thus distinguishing between the human body of Christ and his divine nature dwelling in it. This controversy led on the one side to a confusion or blending of the Divine and human natures of Christ, and on the other, to an equally distinct separation of the two. The advocates of the first view, by a natural reaction, were led to an exaggerated and almost idolatrous homage of the Virgin Mary, whom they began, at length, to style Θεοτόκος, Mother of God. This title seemed to involve the heretical doctrine of Apollinarius, who taught that "the man Christ was without a proper human soul, and that the Divine nature in Christ supplied the place of a rational soul; whence it followed that the two natures were commixed." (Mos. 1. p. 356). To this issue, therefore, the controversy was narrowed down. On the one side the idea of a complete humanity—the body, soul and spirit of man seemed to be denied to Christ. On the other hand, the man and the God in Christ were so sharply distinguished, that there seemed to be the assertion of *two persons* in the one Christ.

Against the former of these positions, and especially against the title Θεοτόκος, mother of God, as applied to Mary, Anastasius, a presbyter of Alexandria, preached a sermon (A. D. 428) in which he took the ground that the "Holy Virgin could only be called χριστοτόκος, mother of Christ, because God could neither be born nor die, so that only the Son of man could be born of Mary." (Mos. 1. p. 357). This position of Anastasius was promptly and powerfully seconded by his friend, Nestorius, then Patriarch of Constantinople. "He rejected the appellation "Mother of God," as heathenish and contrary to Heb. vii. 3, where Christ is likened to Melchisedec, who was "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days nor end of life." Resting his argument upon the orthodox doctrine of "eternal generation," he reasoned,—"A creature did not give birth to him who is uncreated, nor the Father beget of the Virgin a new Word of God or Logos: for 'in the beginning was the Word,' as Jno. says, (i. 1). The creature did not give birth to an uncreated creature,

Digitized by Google

but to a man, the instrument of Deity. The Holy Spirit did not create the word of God or Logos, but made a temple for the Word of God or Logos, of the Virgin, which He migh inhabit." Still Nestorius did not refuse to worship the two natures, since the human is thus so closely and honorably connected with the Divine—"for God," said he, "is inseparable from him who appears to our eyes." His doctrine then was that the natures of Christ ought to be distinctly separated,—that there is a junction (συνάφεια) of the one and the other, an indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) of the Deity.

Against this doctrine, Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, rose up with fiery indignation. These two prelates stood the foremost men of their times. Cyril was of a "restless and arrogant spirit," and already jealous of the popularity and influence of his brother Patriarch of Constantinople. On hearing of the discourses of Nestorius, he promptly reproved the doctrine in a letter addressed to some Egyptian monks who had been won to it by the arguments of Nestorius. To this letter Nestorius replied, and thus a fierce war was waged between these Patriarchs, in which they hurled anathemas at each other with intensest scorn. Each excommunicated the other, but this was of no avail.

At length Theodosius II assembled a Council on the subject. This was the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, known as the third Œcumenical Council. Cyril, the polemic rival of Nestorius, and also his bitter personal enemy, presided. Nestorius was among the first to appear; but John, Bishop of Antioch, and other Eastern bishops were yet five days off, and Nestorius claimed that proceedings should wait for their arrival,—but Cyril would not wait. Nestorius, therefore, refused to appear, and by an ex-parte and violent procedure, he was excommunicated and banished. An impartial review of this whole proceeding will show it to have been disgraceful in the extreme in Cyril, and the final result rather the arbitrary decision of the Emperor upon purely prudential grounds, than a calm and reverential decision of the representative minds of the church. We can regard the matter as little more than a most public declaration of two opposing doctrines on this subject, without shedding any light of reason or casting any weight of authority for or against either. True, the Nestorian party was separated from the Catholic church, but it was an act of the Emperor, through the

Digitized by Google

superior influence of Cyril, not the decision of a general council of Bishops, acting under the light of the Scriptures or in the freedom of their own consciences.

According to Dorner, "We may call the view of Cyril (according to which the human is changed into the divine) the supernatural aspect of the union in question, and that of Nestorius (according to which the two natures are only joined together) the mechanical." (p. 90.)

But the controversy was not ended by the banishment of Nestorius. Civil authority cannot decide questions of theology so as to satisfy the conscience of the church. The condemnation of the error of Nestorius still left the error of Cyril. This restless Patriarch was succeeded by Dioscurus, who, nurtured in the proscriptive spirit of his party, pushed the views of Cyril to the extreme of *confounding* the natures, which it was claimed Nestorius *separated.* This doctrine was elaborated and defended with great force and boldness by Eutyches, a monk of Constantinople, and is known in ecclesiastic history as the Eutychean-monophosite doctrine. Eutyches contended that the flesh of Christ was not the same essence (ὁμοουσιος) as ours, but denied that he taught that Christ brought his body from heaven. This point, as to a different essence in his body, he was driven to yield, but he could not be induced to accept the doctrine of two natures—a human and a divine. Appeal was made by this party to the Emperor Theodosius II to interpose on behalf of their side of the controversy. A Council was called in 449 at Ephesus; Dioscurus was placed at the head of it, and the doctrine of *one nature incarnate* carried the day. Flavinius and Eusebius had boldly withstood the dominant party, and for this Dioscurus demanded their condemnation. This met with a determined opposition, when Dioscurus threw open the doors and a band of miscreant soldiers rushed into the assembly. This was an argument the bishops could not withstand, and forthwith every member (149) signed the decrees. Thus were questions of doctrines decided in the fifth century. The Greeks, in high contempt, called this council συνοδον ληστρικην—*a synod of robbers*—and justly.

But the condemned party could not be repressed. The question was not allowed to rest. Meantime other minds had been considering it and more mature views were forming in the West. Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome, had addressed a letter to Flavian,

Digitized by Google

Bishop of Constantinople, in which he took decided grounds in favor of the doctrine of the two natures. He appealed to Theodosius to call a general council to settle this much vexed question, but this feeble old man was in other keeping. On his death, however, Marcian, his successor, convoked the celebrated Council of Chalcedon (A. D. 451), which is known as the 4th General Council. It was composed of 630 bishops. Here the whole question was discussed with great ability, and the tables were completely turned. Dioscurus was deposed and banished; the acts of the Ephesian Council were rescinded, and the letter of Leo was received as a rule of faith. In the creed which was agreed upon by this Council, care was taken to guard against both Eutychean and Nestorian errors. It is the 5th Article, and reads thus. After recognizing the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Confessions, and Leo's letter to Flavirianus, it proceeds: "Following therefore these holy Fathers, we unitedly declare that one and the same Son, our Lord *Jesus Christ*, is to be acknowledged as being perfect in his Godhead and perfect in his humanity; truly God and truly man, with a rational soul and a body; of like essence (ὁμοουσιος) with the Father, as to his Godhead; and of like essence with us, as to his manhood; in all things like us, sin excepted; begotten (γεννηθεις) of the Father from all eternity, as to his Godhead; and of *Mary*, the mother of God (θεοτοκου), in these last days, for us and for our salvation, as to his manhood; recognized as one Christ, son, Lord, only begotten; in two natures unconfounded, unchanged, undivided, inseparable; the distinctions of natures not at all done away by the union; but rather the peculiarity of each (ἰδιοτης) nature preserved, and combining into one substance (ὑποστασις); not separated or divided into two persons (προσωπα); but one son, only-begotten, God the word, the Lord Jesus Christ; as the prophets before (taught) concerning him, so he, the Lord Jesus Christ, hath taught us, and the creed of the Fathers hath transmitted to us." (Mos. I. 366. n. 31)

Such was the conclusion of the Council of Chalcedon. Of course it was not at once universally acceptable. Various attacks were made against it, and other councils were held and other creeds announced; still this formula gradually settled in the minds of the greatest representative minds of the church and has become the generally accepted expression of orthodoxy on the whole subject. Perhaps the human mind can go no farther either in

Digitized by Google

analysis or synthesis on this subject—and it is not necessary to pursue its history farther.

It is accepted either in substance or in form in all the leading Protestant or Evangelical confesions. The III Art. of the Augsburg Confession of the Lutheran Church; the II of the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England; the Westminster Confession, and the Confession of the Methodist Episcopal Church, all with slight variations in phraseology, contain the same doctrinal view of the natures and person of Christ. It has been found sufficient to meet and exclude every form of heresy that has ever assailed it, and has stood, in harmony with the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity, impregnable against all assaults.

If the Scriptures assert that he is in all things like us, this article affirms his perfect humanity;—if they assert his oneness with God, it affirms his consubstantiality with the Father as to his divinity. If a certain form of heresy would confound or mix these natures,—the perfect human and the perfect divine—so as to make out of them a resultant *tertium quid*, this Confession affirms that they are separate, without mixture, each retaining its peculiar properties. The Deity is as pure as before the union, and the humanity is as pure as before the union. The human nature is not transmuted into the divine, the divine into the human, but the one personality retains and unifies both.

If the objector argues that this makes two Christs—under the mechanical conception of connexion—then the Confession replies, that while there are two natures, there is but one person. The two natures, unaltered by incarnation, are united in one person; so that there results a new person—a *tertium quid*, neither God alone nor man alone, nor these two in distinct personality—but in one personality—the God-man—Immanuel, God with us—not in the sense simply of influence or separate presence, but of personal unity. In his personal consciousness he knows himself at once as God and as man, one and the same person, in whom is united the fullness and perfection of both natures. There is not one person, who in self-contemplation says I am God,—and another who in a distinct self-contemplation says, I am man,—and each contemplating the other as separate from itself, though connected together for definite purposes of joint action;—but there is one person, who in

Digitized by Google

self-contemplation is conscious of two natures, but of both as belonging to one conscious personality. If we speak of Christ therefore in his distinct personality, we cannot call him *God*, nor yet *man*, but must call him God-man. Yet, with reference to his divinity, we may call him God, for he is of perfect divine nature; at the same time, with reference to his humanity, we may call him man, for he is also of perfect human nature. These distinctions have never been more clearly grasped nor forcibly expressed than by Leo the Great in the celebrated Epistle Flaviana, to which we have already referred, and which exercised so powerful an influence over the Synod of Chalcedon. He says, "Two natures met together in our Redeemer, and while the properties of each remained, so great a unity was made of either substance, that from the time that the Word was made flesh in the virgin's womb, we may neither think of him as God without this which is man, nor as man without this which is God. Each nature certifies its own reality under distinct actions, but neither disjoins itself from connection with the other. Nothing is wanting in either towards the other; there is entire littleness in majesty, and entire majesty in littleness; unity does not introduce confusion, nor does propriety divide unity. There is one thing possible, another impossible, yet his is the contumely whose is the glory. He is in infirmity who is in power; the self-same person is both capable and conqueror of death. God did then take on him whole man, and so knit himself into him, and him into himself, in pity and in power, that either nature was in the other, and neither in the other lost its own property." Shedd i. p. 401-2.

The union of two natures in one personal consciousness finds an illustrative analogy in man. He is a being of matter and mind. Both natures are in him—yet neither is changed by the union. We are conscious of both—but there are not two distinct personal consciousnesses, one of mind and the other of matter. Considering man as to his personality, we cannot call him material, nor spiritual—he is both. Yet considering him as to matter, he is material, and as to his mind, he is spiritual; but as to his personality, uniting both these natures, he is man—a personality uniting both natures in one consciousness. The application is plain.

Considering both natures as attributes of one person, it is plain that we can predicate anything that is *essentially* true of either na-

Digitized by Google

ture of this one person. We can say that Jesus Christ wept, eat, was weary, suffered—because these are all true predicates of humanity; at the same time we can say, he "is the same yesterday, to-day and forever"—for this is a proper predicate of God. So do we reconcile those sayings which at one time attribute to him finite limitations, at another infinite attributes. As God-man he could say, "Before Abraham was I am," and yet in the same personality there was the consciousness of having been born in the reign of Augustus. Truly could it be said of him, "He was David's son, and as truly David's Lord."

So as to his sufferings. The God-man suffered—not the God, for to suffer is not an attribute of God. He suffered in his human nature; yet it was the person who suffered, and as the person was infinite so was the suffering. We cannot attribute the attributes of the one nature to the other, but attribute the attritributes of both natures to the one person. Again we find an analogy in the nature of man. Bodily suffering is common both to man and brute. The mind however is not the immediate subject of bodily suffering; yet man feels suffering with a poignancy greater than the brute because of his mental and moral nature. His consciousness is that of a being of mind and matter, and his suffering is *human* agony, not simply *brutish*. We can only suggest this line of reasoning. We leave you to make the application.

I must take time to call your attention to another important application of the doctrine of this Chalcedon Christology. It is that the ground and basis of the personality is in the Logos. Deity descends upon man—man does not assume Deity. The word becomes flesh—the flesh does not rise up into the Logos. This distinction properly used in argument will sap the foundation of all fancied theories of human progress going on by a process of self-elevation, till it shall scale the heights of Divinity. It is the old error of the Babel builders—the tragic myth of piling Ossa upon Pelion. Man does not rise up and become God by self-elevation. The Logos stoops down by sublime condescension to the fallen, and so only are they lifted up in him.

And in this union he took not any form or person existing—but took our nature in its essence,—not the *person* of a son of Adam, but, descending in his own person, as the 2nd of the Trinity, he took humanity, the seed of Abraham, and thus lifted up the finite by union with the infinite. Thus only can it be saved.

W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE PUBLIC TREASURY.

Sometime ago we wrote an article in the *Harbinger*, entitled 'The Established Church of New York,' in which it was shown that the Catholic church had become, far beyond any other, the one favored church of the State and city of New York, receiving constantly for its own religious purposes immense grants of money and property. This was sustained by an actual statement of facts and figures. The revelations made by a strong writer in *Putnam's Magazine*, on which we mainly relied for our facts, were so damaging to the 'New York State Church,' i. e., the Romish church, that the *Catholic World* came out in a defensive article, written, as was to be expected, in the pleasantest, most humble and ingenious manner, and with an ingenuousness and candor that was calculated, and no doubt intended, 'to deceive the very elect.' The Catholics are masters of this sort of play. It is a species of dialectics highly prized among them, and in which their chosen men, who are to do this kind of work 'for the glory of the church,' are most diligently trained. Their masters or equals in this respect are not easily found. While behind, far behind, concealed, are the most terrible lust of absolute dominion, intolerance, persecution, hatred and cursings of Protestants, asserted in an extreme manner and with a bold effrontery that makes the very face of heaven to pale,—on the surface there plays the 'most winning grace' of childlike innocence and love. This is where they are yet in the minority,—beggars of favors; where the stake of power is to be played for. When once the victory is gained, the mask is thrown off, and bold pretense and proud assurance take the place of the previous disguise.

The charges against the Catholics were made in *Putnam* about the middle of last year, and based on subsidies granted to 'the church' in previous years. The *Catholic World* indignantly repelled the whole charge of 'the church' having received any special favors,—nay it was still the 'step-child' in the good will of the State; it had not yet received its due share, it was yet the meek, uncomplaining sufferer, the 'spouse of Jesus,' with *spiritual* aspirations only, 'lowly in heart,' and disregarded of men.—Hear this Catholic writer,—in whose matter and manner no one

Digitized by Google

need fail to recognize the able hand of Father Hecker,—in his defense against *Putnam:*

"But is it true that the State or the city does proportionately less for non-Catholic charitable or educational institutions—not a few of which are well known to be formed for the very purpose of picking up, we might say kidnapping, Catholic poor children, and bringing them up in some form of Protestantism or infidelity *—than it does for Catholic charitable institutions? Most certainly not. It does far less for Catholic than for non-Catholic institutions; and yet, because it does a little for institutions, though for the benefit of the whole community, under the control and management of Catholics, the State and city are calumniated, and we are insulted by its being pretended that our church is made the State church."

These words breathe the air of the most transparent candor and sincerity; it is the language of injured innocence. The idea of the Catholics getting *much*, is a grievous error; they have received but 'a little,' and are 'insulted' for it by the others, who have received so *much!* On the question of the Catholics having received an undue proportion, the writer goes on to say:

"In this matter of State grants or city donations, the Protest-

* This statement is redolent with the delicious fragrance of Jesuitic sincerity. One would be almost disposed to believe the Catholics know nothing of getting up schools and other institutions 'for the very purpose of picking up, we might say kidnapping' *Protestant* 'poor children, and in bringing them up in' the Catholic Church! Perhaps nobody knows that Rome is built on the Tiber! When the world knows that it has been one of the chief operations and boasts of the Catholic Church, to 'pick up' Protestant children and in its schools to educate them for Rome; when it is history that they tore the infants from the bosoms of Huguenot mothers, and the young children from the embrace of Huguenot parents, and dragged them to Catholic schools and convents, and brought them up to hate and curse their parents; when it is known that Jewish children were kidnapped in our day in Rome, and kept from their parents by the Pope himself, against the remonstrance of a world, as he acknowledged; when it is known that American bishops have boasted in Europe that by the help of European money to support Catholic schools in this country, they would succeed 'in converting' the youth of America,—it is more than surprising to hear a Catholic talk so feelingly about 'picking up children.' But Rome is Rome.

C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

ant mind proceeds upon a sad fallacy. The divisions of Protestants among themselves count for nothing in a question between them and Catholics. Protestants overlook this fact, and while they call all grants and donations to Catholic institutions sectarian, they call none sectarian of all that made to Protestant institutions which are not under the control and management of some particular denomination of Protestants, as the Episcopalian, the Presbyterian, the Baptist, or the Methodist; but this is a grave error, and cannot fail to mislead the public. All grants and donations made to institutions, charitable or educational, not under the control and management of Catholics, are made to non-Catholics; and with the exception of those made to Hebrews, to Protestant institutions. There are but two religions to be counted, Catholic and Protestant. The rule is to count on one side whatever is given to institutions under Catholic control and management, and on the other side all that is given for similar purposes to all the institutions, whether public or private, not under Catholic control and management. The question, then, comes up, Have the State and city given proportionately greater amounts to Catholic charitable and other institutions than to Protestant institutions? If not, we have no more than our share, and the Protestant clamor is unjust and indefensible.....If the State adopts the policy of granting subsidies, we demand for our institutions our proportions of the subsidies granted. Have we received more than our proportion? Nay, have we received anything like our proportion?"

The writer further claims "that Catholic charities and schools do not receive, in grants and donations, a tithe of what is honestly or justly their share—whether estimated according to their numbers or according to the amount of public taxes, for sectarian, charitable and educational purposes levied on them by the State and its municipalities." The reader will be curious to know how this Catholic writer makes out so absurd a statement.

It is by the ingenious plea that all the institutions not Catholic are to be set off against the Catholic; among the former, then, he ranges Asylums for the Blind, the Deaf and Dumb, Idiots, Insane, &c., Agricultural and Normal Schools, Houses of Refuge, &c., &c. This is the trick. We shall come back to it again.

One more quotation: "We will only say that the church has had, thus far; in this country, no endowment, and has no source of revenue but the unfailing charity of the faithful."

Digitized by Google

All this was published in August of last year, 1869. The unsuspecting and confiding, those not initiated into the duplicity of Rome, would, of course, conclude from the earnest protestations and the apparently frank statements of *facts* of this writer, that the idea of drawing constant and disproportionately large subventions from the secular treasury of New York, State or city, was the farthest possible from the minds of the New York Catholics; that it was one of the morbid dreams of Protestants,—a 'vision' as the writer calls it, 'airy' and 'unsubstantial,'—one of those unrighteous charges under which 'the true church,' has perpetually to suffer. Of course, that the Catholic church of the city of New York, at the very time this defensive article was written, was actually thus plundering the city treasury, and that this writer knew it, would be utterly incredible. That the year 1869 should be signalized by such plundering of the treasury 'for the glory of the church,' would be in shocking discord with the sweet music of this Catholic charmer. But let us see the facts.

The peculations for 'the church,' in the city of New York, have become so startling in boldness and magnitude, that the citizens have become aroused with indignation, and a strong organization appointed an able committee to investigate the matter. At the head of this committee was Dr. Francis Lieber, the well-known statistician. This committee have made and published their report. Referring to the *annual* plundering of the city treasury of New York for the benefit of sectarian institutions, the report says:

"This evil began a short time ago under the specious form of begging from the City Treasury a few dollars for some deserving charity controlled and owned by several hundred religious sects into which our people are divided. It has in a few years made such gigantic strides that it now abstracts from the city treasury, of the money raised by general taxation, half a million of dollars and uses the greater part of this to destroy our system of public schools.

"To make this annual injustice the more easy and certain, during the expiring moments of the Legislature, last spring, a cunning hand foisted into the tax levy for this city, section 10: a section that in its practical results enables the managers of a few sectarian schools to put their hands into the public treasury, and to extract therefrom, over two hundred thousand dollars ($200,-

Digitized by Google

000) a year, and use it for a set of private schools, that in effect undermine our equitable and admirable system of public schools.

"That section is as follows:—

'Section 10. Hereafter, an annual amount, equal to twenty per cent. on the excise money received for said city in eighteen hundred and sixty-eight, to be distributed under the direction of an officer to be appointed for that purpose by the Board of Education of said city (whose compensation shall be paid from such amount) for the support of schools, educating children gratuitously in said city who are not provided for in the common schools thereof, excepting therefrom schools receiving contributions for their support from the city treasury.' (*New York Session Laws of* 1869, *Chap* 876, *Sec.* 10.)

"This section is not for one year but for all time.

"The false pretense, for it is, that the children of these sectarian schools are not provided for in the common schools of this city. The fact is, that there were, at the time this section was thrust into the tax levy, and now are, vacant seats enough in the common schools in this city to accommodate all the children of every private school in the city.

"The average number of vacant seats in the common schools in this city is over thirty-nine thousand (39,000), [Report of Special Com. of Board of Education, Oct. 6, 1869, page 17,] and the common schools furnish gratis to all the children of the city, without distinction of sect, every thing that these sectarian schools furnish, except the single item of sectarian religious instruction.

"The children in the common schools of this city have more comfortable and healthful schoolrooms, better lighted and ventilated, and better provided with books, apparatus and teachers, than those in the sectarian schools have.

"The common schools make excellent citizens of a free and tolerant Republic."

The report gives a full and detailed account of all the donations drawn under this iniquitous, surreptitious legislation from the city treasury, *naming* every school and institution with the specific sum granted to each. The entire amount of these subventions to sectarian institutions, is $528,742.47. How much of all this went to the Catholics—to "the schools and institutions under Catholic control and management?" If the writer in the *Catholic World* teaches us the truth, we must believe, according to our notions of the meaning of language, that they shared but poorly;

Digitized by Google

that they stood humbly by, receiving meekly 'the crumbs that fell from the table,' for he tells us, that they had received nothing like their proportion,'—in fact—to quote his words,—"Yet, because they do *a little* for Catholic institutions, the State and city are calumniated," &c. Now what was the 'little' the Catholics were getting of this half-a-million, while Father Hecker was writing these words? Just $412,062.26, nearly four-fifths of the whole! Thiis is the comment on the article in the *Catholic World*; this the verification of the statement that "the church has no source of revenue but the unfailing charity of the faithful"! We can only understand this language, and accept it as true, if by the 'faithful' are meant, not the thousands of rich and the tens of thousands of poor in the Catholic Church, but the miserable *politicians* of New York and elsewhere, whose fidelity surely has proved to be an "unfailing source of revenue to the church"! But it is well for us in this matter, to understand the plea of the Catholics according to their own exposition of it. There is a meaning in it, we had better comprehend as soon as possible.—They mean what they say when they tell us, that when they receive four hundred thousand out of half-a-million of 'subventions' out of the public treasury,—four times as much as all the rest of New York together that outnumbers them in population and owns a thousand dollars to their one,—they "have received nothing like their proportion;" that, "in fact," it is but "a little" of all that is due them. What then, we ask in sober truth, is the sum of their demands? Where half-a-million is "a little," ten millions can be no more than the *all* that is due. This "little" so far beneath the full proportion due the Catholics, includes another item set forth in the report of the committee above cited. The report says:

"In addition to this (the 400,000 dollars in 1869 together with large sums in previous years) in 1866, for one dollar, the city government gave to the archbishop of this sect half a block of ground on Madison and toward Fourth avenues, worth now two hundred thousand dollars ($200,000.)

"In 1852 they gave to the same sect the fee of a whole block of ground running from Fifth to Fourth avenues, and from Fiftieth to Fifty-first streets, by changing a lease into a fee, for the sum of eighty-three dollars and thirty-two cents ($83 32), and then, in 1864, paid the same sect twenty-four thousand dollars

Digitized by Google

($24,000) for the privilege of extending Madison avenue across this block; and also made this sect a donation of eight thousand nine hundred and twenty-eight dollars and eighty-four cents ($8,928.84), to pay all assessments on this block for opening Madison avenue.

"A moderate estimate of the present value of this block of ground is one million and a half dollars ($1,500,000.)

"In 1864 they gave the same sect, for one dollar, four hundred and fifty feet (450 ft.) of the Fifth avenue end of the block of ground adjoining the last and between Fifty-first and Fifty-second streets; and then in 1867, for one dollar a year rent, gave this sect the rest of this block; thus practically donating the whole block running through from Fifth to Fourth avenues; which block is estimated to be worth another million and a half dollars [$1,500,000.]

"The city government has thus given three million two hundred thousand dollars ($3,200,000) worth of real estate to a single sect for sectarian purposes.

"Now if the other religious sects were each treated by our city government with like liberality the city of New York would in a few years become the very paradise of religious corporations: for they would have absorbed into their dead hands [Mortmain], either by donation or taxation, all the estate, real and personal, in this city. [Blackstone says, that but for the Statutes of Mortmain, Ecclesiastical corporations would soon have engulphed the whole real estate of England."]

If this, then,—these immense sums, are but a mean "little," not a tithe of what the Catholics even now claim as their due, let us from it learn what demands they intend to make, as soon, and as fast, as they get the power to do it effectually, into their hands.

We are taught another important lesson, as to the views, the spirit and purposes of the Catholic Church in our country, when we look into the plea by which its representatives seek to sustain these enormous demands on the public treasury. In this plea it is stated, as already quoted, that "the true rule is to count on one side all given to institutions under Catholic control and management, and on the other side, whatever is given for similar purposes to all other institutions, public or private, not under Catholic control and management." How far this non-Catholic category is to be understood as extending, it further explains. "Have we re-

Digitized by Google

ceived more than our proportion? Nay, have we received anything like our proportion? We find from the official report made to the State convention, that the total of grants made by the State to charitable and other institutions—including the New York Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, the New York Institution for the Blind, the Society for the Reformation of Juvenile Delinquents of New York, State Agricultural College, State Normal School, the Western House of Refuge for Juvenile Delinquents, State Lunatic Asylum, the Asylum for Idiots, the Willard Asylum for the Insane, academies, orphan asylums, &c., hospitals, &c., Colleges, Universities, &c., and miscellaneous, have amounted for twenty-one years ending with 1867, to $6,920,881,91. Of this large amount, Catholics should have received for their institutions certainly not less than one million of dollars "

Now, so far as it relates to institutions in this enumeration that have a religious cast, we do not object to the Catholic argument. But here we have a large number that are not of this class, but are institutions having no relation to any church whatever, but of a purely benevolent and secular character, and such as are properly embraced in the duties of a State. We are to understand now, that all these,—the public institutions for the unfortunates, and for criminals, and for agricultural science, and all other similar institutions, because they are not "under the control and management of Catholics," are all to be counted as separate from the Catholics, and as opposed to them; and that these as having no part or lot in these institutions, and regarding their interests as alien from and opposed to them,—have a right to demand from the State a proportionate amount for similar purely Catholic institutions. We are to understand then: 1. That the spirit and doctrine of the Church forbids its members, as citizens of the State, from cooperating with their fellow citizens, by State or municipal enactments, in supporting institutions of purely industrial, or scientific benevolent aims, such as all states have felt it their duty to create and sustain;—that there can be no active, co-operative fellow-citizenship between a Catholic and a non-Catholic citizen in all the wide domain of such state and municipal enterprise. The Catholic church establishes this impassable gulf. 2. That the State or municipality and the Catholic church are, in these regards, rival and discordant powers, and that the members of the Catholic church, consequently, cannot be cit-

Digitized by Google

izens supporting the State, and good Catholics at the same time. 3. That the secular power, State or city, must give an account to the Catholic church as such, for the creation and support of such non-religious institutions; must look, in its legislation, at the Catholic citizen as separate and distinct from all the other citizens,—must treat him as a Catholic; and finally, must pay to the Catholic church, as a debt, for such "similar" institutions as it chooses to establish "under Catholic management and control," sums in full proportion to the amounts expended on these State or municipal institutions, though these be separate from all sect or religious "control or management;"—thus greatly contracting or altogether giving up its activity in these most necessary and praiseworthy enterprises, or in every instance having to make two appropriations, one for its own creations, and one, in full proportion for the Catholics, these to use theirs for any purpose they please,—to educate Jesuits, support nunneries, &c., &c. 4, and finally, That the "rule" in the land is to be the division, recognized by the State, of Catholic and non-Catholic citizens, thus establishing religious tests; and into these two categories also all institutions are to be arranged, as on two distinct and opposite and rival "sides." Such are the deductions from the "rule" laid down by the *Catholic World*,—and it is a doctrine in full harmony with the teachings and actions of Romanism for ages. We only ask, Is it possible to reconcile such a position with the spirit, the political maxims, the laws and institutions of our, or any other, enlightened, free country? and will the American people,—we do not mean those lepers of our society, the corrupt politicians,—ever accept such a rule?

We have yet something more to say on another part of this case,—the participation of others than Catholics in these "subsidies" from the public treasuries; but we defer it for another month.

C. L. L.

REPEATED AND PROLONGED VIGILS.

The Abbe de la Caille, a famous astronomer, invented a kind of fork in which he adjusted his head, and thus passed nights in observation of the sky, without knowing any other enemies than sleep and the clouds, and without suspecting that there was a sweeter employment of those silent hours which revealed to him

Digitized by Google

the harmony of the world. He contracted in this way an inflammation of the chest, which carried him off in a few days. The painter Girodet did not like to work in the daytime. Seized in the middle of the night with a fever of inspiration, he would rise, light lustres suspended in his studio, set upon his head an enormous hat covered with wax-lights, and in this singular costume he would paint for whole hours. As might be expected, few have had more wretched constitutions, or more dilapidated health than Girodet. Toward the end of his short life his genius seemed wedded to a corpse.

The cruel wakefulness that torments thinkers wears out life indeed with fearful rapidity, whether by shortening its duration or by diminishing its effective power. Vigils while depriving the body of rest, over-excite the cerebral activity, augment that enormous expense of nervous energy made in the work of thought, and keep up a fluxion of blood to the head. They thus prevent the repair of the waste of force, or at least oppose a complete restoration of power (since this requires in sleep a collapse of the brain by diversion of its circulating volume toward other viscera). Often, indeed, the thinker, wearied and overcome, leaves his work, to court sleep. But sleep shuns him, and the wished-for calm comes not, the excited circulation of the brain continues. That cerebral tension, so much coveted in order to produce and to combine continues the master where it was invoked as the servant. At last, after the lapse of many wakeful nights, a restless, troubled sleep imperfectly repairs the forces destined to be again consumed. "Such nights abridge our days," says Bacon. How dear Nature makes us expiate our contempt for her laws and her lessons!

In the works of men of letters, of orators, and poets, every chapter, every paragraph, is the investment of a portion of their life. Goethe lived long, notwithstanding his immense labors, and yet the excitement of his brain when at work, almost always led to accidents; the composition of each of his great works was followed by a malady. Woe to those imprudent vanities that would supply by forced labor what Nature has refused them!—*Appleton's Journal.*

Kindness is the life-blood of love and good will. We are always under an obligation to be kind. To all men we owe a debt of love. We must render to all their dues.

Digitized by Google

THE BIBLE IN THE COLLEGE AND IN THE COMMON SCHOOLS.

I believe that Bethany College, under the immediate presidency of its distinguished founder, A. Campbell, was the first to introduce and accept the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as a classic—the first and best of classics. In fact, this time-honored Institution was founded upon the Bible;—not the version of King James, nor any other version, but the Bible, as God's Inspired Book—His only speech in the language of man to men. He therefore drew from the fountain-head of inspiration, and so far as the common version was true to the original, he accepted it; and where it was not, he corrected and made it conform to the infallible records of our faith and knowledge.

The effect of this striking feature of Bethany College has been seen and felt everywhere throughout the land in giving greater importance to the Sacred Oracles. Especially is this seen in the institutions of learning that have risen among us. In all our colleges the Bible has been introduced; and Bible lectures, some portions of the year, have been inaugurated. In the Kentucky University a Bible College is a distinguishing element in that Institution, for the benefit of those who may wish to prepare for the ministry. But we like the original plan introduced by Bro. Campbell, of laying down the Bible as the corner stone of the college, and making it a necessary part of the curriculum. I believe it is still adhered to in Bethany, and hope that it will never be abandoned. In addition, it has also a course of Bible lectures for the benefit of those who desire giving themselves to the work of the Lord.

The Bible studies in Bethany have made some mighty men; and have given character to that institution above all others in the land. As long as this feature in the daily exercises of that college shall exist, our brethren should rally to its support, and fill its ample halls with their children and friends. The *animus* of Bethany is the same now it has ever been; and its President and professors perfectly competent to carry out the grand designs of its original founder.

There is no book in any language so full of thought as the Bible. The classics in the Greek and Latin languages, which form the basis of a thorough course of education in all our col-

Digitized by Google

leges, *are barren in thought.* They are studied and valued, because they improve the taste in composition, and not for the knowledge they communicate. They are models of art in polite literature. No one expects to find in them all that is necessary to inform the judgment; to cultivate the intellect; to elevate the moral sentiments; or to improve the heart. For such purposes they are almost useless. The literature of our own language is incomparably greater in these respects than can be found elsewhere. The quickening influence and power of the Scriptures of truth over those speaking the English language, no one can deny. The Bible has done more to improve the finest portions of our race, in science and in art, in mind and in manners, in morality and in religion, than all other books known.

Rosseau said: "The majesty of the Scriptures strikes me with astonishment. Never was the most profound wisdom expressed with so much energy or simplicity." Fenelon, when comparing it with those standards of excellence—the classics—observes,—"The Scripture surpasses the most ancient Greek authors vastly, in naked simplicity and grandeur. Homer himself never reached the sublimity of Moses' songs, or equaled Isaiah, describing the majesty of God. Never did any ode, either Greek or Latin, come up to the loftiness of the Psalms. There is as great difference between the heathen poets and the prophets, as there is between a false enthusiasm and the true."

In addition to these testimonies, one from an infidel and the other from a priest, let us hear what the incomparable scholar, Sir William Jones, after an acquaintance with the literature of at least twenty-eight different languages, said in regard to the Scriptures: "They contain more true sublimity, more exquisite beauty, purer morality, more important history, and finer strains, both of poetry and of eloquence, *than could be collected within the same compass from all other books which were ever composed, in any age or in any idiom.*"

This is the Book that the Catholics, Infidels and Rationalists have formed a crusade against to run out of the public schools. These are fit associates. It would be safer for Rome and her religion, if the Bible were annihilated. This book, instead of giving the outline and spirit of the Papal church, as identical with the Apostolic, describes it as the Apostate. There never was a greater deception practiced upon any people than that of forcing

Digitized by Google

Romanism upon them for Christianity. It is a medley of Judaism, Paganism, and tradition, with a spice of Christian teaching, exaggerated and deformed, to give it some countenance and support. I venture to say that if twelve men of unsophisticated mind, who had never heard of the New Testament, should examine it with the aid of the most perfect translations to be found, and should devote a life time to the work, they would utterly fail to find the most remote trace of such an ecclesiasticism as the Papal church.

The Catholic priests know well that the New Testament does not contain the religion of the Vatican, and they dare not trust it in the hands of their people without note or comment. The only books they are compelled to acknowledge as inspired, give them no authority for what they deem an infallible church!—Where there are common schools and an open Bible, the Papacy cannot live. Where Peter and Paul speak, the Papacy says, "The Pope and his cardinals we know, but who are ye?" The true reason why Rome is opposed to the Bible is because the Bible is opposed to it. It is not because the common version is defective or Protestant. They are equally opposed to the Douay, and will not trust either without assuming the right of interpreting it. Rome says, "The Council of Trent is to judge of the meaning and interpretation of Holy Writ;" and therefore it is not to be trusted with the people in church or State, in the family or the school, without "Holy Mother" to interpret it. Are the people of this country prepared for this? If the Bible is thrown out of the common schools, it will be done in the interests of the Papacy. With the priest to interpret it, there would be no objection to it in the public schools; and if ever they can muster sufficient strength, they will use it in this way. The question now is not whether we shall introduce the Bible into the common schools, but whether we ought not to cast it out. It is there by right of preemption. It has been placed there by public consent. The State in various ways has recognized its value and importance. It exists among us with all the sacredness of prescription, and by sanction of the State. Who has the right to eject it. If the Romanist, then he has rights that no other sect has. The rejection of the Bible from the "people's colleges" is equivalent to the introduction of the Papacy into them. It is ither the Bible or the Pope! JAMES CHALLEN.

Digitized by Google

FRAGRANCE.

Of all man's sources of enjoyment, none display more clearly the bountifulness of God than the fragrant odors of nature. The world might have been made entirely scentless, and yet every essential purpose been fulfilled. The vegetable kingdom, which is the great storehouse of perfumes, might have performed all its functions, and yet not a single plant exhaled an agreeable odor. Fragrance seems so wholly superfluous and accidental, that we cannot but infer that it was imparted to the objects which possess it, not for their own sakes, but for our perpetual gratification. We regard it as a peculiar blessing sent to us directly from the hands of our Heavenly Father; and we are the more confirmed in this idea by the fact that the human period is the only epoch of fragrant plants. Geologists inform us that all the previous eras of the earth's history were destitute of perfumes. Forests of club-mosses and ferns hid in their sombre bosom no bright-eyed floweret, and shed from their verdant boughs no scented richness on the passing breeze. Palms and deciduous trees, though ushering in the dawn of a brighter floral day, produced no perfume-breathing blossoms. It is only when we come to the human period that we meet for the first time with an odoriferous flora. God placed man in a sweet-scented garden as his home. He adorned it with labiate flowers, modest in form and sober in hue, but exhaling a rich aromatic fragrance at every pore; and so widely and lavishly did He distribute this class of plants over the globe, that at the present day in the south of Europe they form one-nineteenth part of the flora; in the tropics one twenty-sixth; and even on the chill plains of Lapland, out of every thirty-five plants, one is sure to be a sweet-smelling labiate. In our own country the tribe is peculiarly abundant and highly prized. Basil, marjoram, and lavender, balm and mint, rosemary and thyme, are dear to every heart, and are as fragrant as their own leaves with the sweetest poetry of rural life. Banished now from the garden to make room for rich and rare exotics, they still linger in romantic, old-fashioned places, and are carefully cultivated by the cottager in his little plot of ground. In quiet country villages the lavender-sprig still scents the household linen; the bouquet of balm or mint is still carried to church with the Bible and the white pocket-handkerchief, and mingles its peculiar perfume with the devotional exer-

Digitized by Google

cises; and the rosemary is still placed on the snowy shroud of the dead cottager, soothingly suggestive of the sweet and lasting perfume left behind in the dark tomb, by the Rose of Sharon, Mary's son, who once lay there. All these are indeed "plants of grey renown," as Shenstone calls them. They came into the world with man; they were created for man's special gratification; and they have continued ever since in intimate fellowship with him as ministers to some of his simplest and purest joys. They were prepared, too, against the day of Christ's anointing and burying; for the costly spikenard with which Mary anointed Jesus's feet, and some of the finest spices with which Joseph of Arimathea embalmed his dead body, were products of the labiate family; and in this sacred use of them they have received a consecration which forever hallows them to the Christian heart.

No sense is more closely connected with the sphere of soul than the sense of smell. It reaches more directly and excites more powerfully the emotional nature than either sight or hearing. It is an unexplored avenue, leading at once, and by a process too enchanting to examine, into the ideal world. Its very vagueness and indefiniteness make it more suggestive, and quicken the mind's consciousness. Its agency is most subtle and extensive—going down to the very depths of our nature and back to the earliest dawn of life. Memory especially is keenly susceptible to its influence. Every one knows how instantaneously a particular odor will recall the past circumstances associated with it. Trains of association long forgotten—glimpses of old familiar things—mystic visions and memories of youth, beyond the reach even of the subtle power of music—are brought back by the perfume of some little flower noteless to all others. Looks of long ago answer to our gazing—touches of hands, soft as a young trembling bird lying in ours—words that were brimful of tenderness, joys that had no sorrow in their satisfying fruitage—come back with the passing breath of mignonette, caught from some garden by the wayside in the sweet, sad autumn eve. Lime-blossoms, murmurous with bees in the shady aveuue—hyacinth-bells, standing sentinel beside some sapphire spring—violets, like children's eyes heavy with sleep, on some greenwood bank—each exhales a fragrance into which all the heart of Nature seems to melt, and touches joyous soul, or woebegone, with the memories of the years. It is on account of this far-reaching power of fragrance,

Digitized by Google

its association with the deep and hidden things of the heart, that so many of the Bible images appeal to our sense of smell. It is regarded as an important means of communication with heaven, and a direct avenue for the soul's approach to the Father of Spirits. The acceptance of man's offerings by God is usually represented in the anthropomorphism of the Bible, as finding its expression in the sense of smell. When Noah offered the first sacrifice after the flood, "the Lord," we are told, "smelled a sweet savor." The drink-offerings and the various burnt-offerings prescribed by Levitical law, were regarded as a sweet savor unto the Lord. Christ, the antetype of these institutions, is spoken of as having given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet smelling savor. And the Apostle Paul, employing the same typical language, speaks of himself and the other Apostles as "unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish. To the one we are the savor of death unto death, and to the other the savor of life unto life." The Psalms and the prophetic writings are full of the most beautiful and expressive metaphors, applied to the most solemn persons and things, borrowed from perfumes; while the whole of the Song of Solomon is like an oriental garden stocked with delicious flowers, as grateful to the sense of smell as to the sense of sight. —*Sunday Magazine.*

BRO. KNOWLES SHAW—THE EVANGELIST.

We have just had the pleasure of spending part of a day with our earnest and devoted brother Knowles Shaw, of Rushville, Ind. He is holding a protracted meeting for our neighbors at Wellsburg. It has been two weeks in progress, and up to the present time over one hundred have been added to the church, nearly al of them by baptism. He began the meeting in December, but was summoned home by the illness of a beloved daughter, a noble and lovely Christian girl, whom it pleased the Father soon after to take home to himself. We have never been more strongly impressed with the power of the Christian's faith to lighten these heavy crosses, than when hearing brother S. speak of his bereavement. There is infinitely more than resignation: the door of the heavenly mansion seems opened to his view, and the radiance from within, spans even the dark river.

Digitized by Google

Returning to Wellsburg, he has been preaching every evening to crowded houses, and with continually increasing interest on the part of his hearers. A prominent feature in the character of brother Shaw is *earnestness*, and God is blessing it as He ever delights to do. He is a man of his own sort—and works in a way all his own. His heart is full of the love of souls, faith in the gospel, and a sense of dependence upon the divine blessing for success; and in this spirit he works—day and night, from house to house—on the streets, in the offices of business, and in all places where men do congregate. His success is a fine illustration of the power of love to win the prejudiced and to unite the divided. All classes and denominations throng to hear brother Shaw. They feel that he loves them and the truth—and will sacrifice anything lawful, to save them. We hope to have still further triumphs of the truth to report before this meeting is closed.

W. K. P.

Literary Notices.

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE.—The February number of this Magazine contains:—The Vicar of Bullhampton, Part viii.; The Bird; The Pen Family; Match Making; Under False Colors; High life, or sketches in Switzerland; The Freedman and his future—Part ii.; Beyond the Breakers—Concluded; Our Geographical Sponsors; An Extraordinary Episode; The Report of the Special Commissioner; Edwin M. Stanton.—Secret History of Lincoln's Cabinet; and the usual monthly gossip and literary notices.

THE GALAXY.—Contents of February number: "Put yourself in his Place," by Charles Read, continued; Erinna's Spinning; Expressions; Brigham Young; Polly Mariner, Tailoress; Ten years in Rome; The Bedouin's Rebuke; The Oversoul of Manse Roseburgh; Ventilation and Warming—by Jno. C. Draper; A Hundred Years Ago; Letters from Havana; An Editor's Tales; and the usual Drift-wood, Miscellany and Literary Notices.

We have received the January number of "GOOD WORDS," a monthly magazine of literature, science, art and travel, edited by Norman MaCleod, D. D., London, and republished in this country by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Philadelphia. It is in every re-

Digitized by Google

spect a first-class monthly, its contributions being from the pens of the most able writers in England. Each number is profusely illustrated. Two serial stories are commenced in the January number, 'Carlino,' and 'Dorothy Fox.' The other articles are as follows: 'The Air Mothers,' by Rev. Chas. Kingsley; 'Days in North India,' by the Editor; 'Lady Noel Byron;' 'Two Songs,' by Jean Ingelow; 'A Visit to the Country of the Vaudois,' by Samuel Smiles, author of 'Self-help;' 'The Christianity of the Present and of the Future,' by Dean Alford; 'Our Working people, and how they live;' 'Work;' 'My Time-piece'—a poem; 'The French Reformatory of St. Michel;' 'The Apostle of Greenland.' Terms:—Yearly subscription, $2.75; single number, 25 cts.; two copies, $5; five copies, $11.25; ten copies, $20.50.

ALMANACS.—We are in receipt of The World Almanac for 1870, No. 35 Park Row, New York; The Public Ledger, Geo. W. Childs, Philadelphia, Pa.; Landreth's Rural Register and Almanac; and Miner's Pittsburgh Almanac;—For which many thanks.

SUNDAY SCHOOL COLLECTIONS.

Will all Preachers and Sunday School men help us to establish a regular S. S. collection *the first Lord's day of every month* for the missions?

All our Evangelists work for Sunday Schools, and the children should be taught to help support them.

A large amount can be raised this way if all will attend to it.—Send the money quarterly to your district treasurer, if your district is organized; if not, send to me to Cincinnati. O., Box 321.

THOMAS MUNNELL.

Good Words from Our Correspondents.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—You will be glad to learn that 583, (perhaps more) have been added to the churches in Mississippi during the year just past. We have been trying to do something in the way of missionary work. Bro. B. F. Manire has served as Evangelist during the entire year. Breth. Drs. Barbee and Jones, and myself, since our semi-annual meeting in July. At our annual meeting, held in Jackson, Dec.

Digitized by Google

11, Bro. Manire was appointed State Evangelist, and Dr. Barbee and myself, District Evangelists. Bro. Jones edits the Christian Unitist.

Your brother in Christ, ALEX. ELLETT.

STARKVILLE, Miss., Dec. 31, 1869.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Bro. John Morgan and Father Blankenship conducted a meeting of 16 days with the congregation at Prairie Bird, last Spring, with 51 additions—35 baptized, the rest reclaimed and out of other churches.——Yours in Christ, THOS. A. ECKEL.

RURALTOWN, Shelby co , Ill., Jan. 3, 1870.

WEST LIBERTY, W, VA., Feb. 17, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—The religious interest in the Sixteenth District of Ohio has been very marked for some time. Bro. Joseph Dunn is the general Evangelist for the district; but many of the churches, in addition to assisting in this mission, have called to their aid other ministers of the word and nobly sustained them in their work.

Since the opening of the new house at Hendrysburg, there have been added to the Lord there some sixteen souls. At Morristown about thirty. At Millwood some of the brethren protracted the meeting at the close of our Teachers' Meeting with fifty-four additions to the church. There were over fifty at Malaga; fourteen, I believe, at Texas; eight at Harmony, and a few at various other places.

We have just received a letter from Warren county, Tennessee, which says: "We have had some very fine meetings the past season in this region. At the Smyrna church we had over thirty additions, and a great many at other places." Thus the work goes on. Amen!

Yours in Christ, A. E. M.

ERAMOSA, ONTARIO, CANADA, Feb. 1, 1870.

BRO. PENDLETON:—I have nothing particular to notice concerning the good cause in Ontario. I believe, in general, the brethren are doing as well as usual, holding their own and gaining a few, and trying to live as Christians should. Where the truth is being faithfully proclaimed the success is always up to my expectation in the circumstances, though neither the effort or the success is by any means what ought to satisfy us. Bros. Lisler, Sheppard and Sinclair, all reliable and good men, have been exclusively devoting their time to the advancement of the cause, and their labors have been honored by the Lord in building up the saints and converting sinners, but I cannot report the number added by their labors. Besides these we have many brethren, equally firm and intelligent in the Scriptures, who do not go much from home, but who are active and useful members in the churches and neighborhoods where they reside, and by their means the simple teaching of the Bible is kept before the people in many parts of the country, and no doubt much good is done.

Digitized by Google

Alongside with these encouraging features, and in order to form a correct estimate of our condition, I could add considerable on the other side, but I forbear, and spare you and myself some pain. There is, however, nothing but what may be expected always in the present state of humanity.

I have not been much from home for some time, and may not be much from home during the cold weather. The churches around here are in peace and harmony and never have any trouble with *aspiring* pastors or *usurping* Evangelists. Yours, truly, JAMES BLACK.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Knowing that you are always pleased to hear news of the success of the ancient Gospel, we propose to give you a brief account of a new missionary effort organized by a few of our brethren and sisters in this city. About the middle of October, after carefully considering the matter, we concluded to start our effort in a hall used through the week for *dancing!* Probably the first time any service of a religious nature was ever held there was on the 17th day of October last, when the Disciples, to the number of about forty, met to break bread in memory of their Lord and Savior.

The next Lord's day, October 24th, after an old-fashioned Gospel sermon by Bro. Chas. Bond, we had the pleasure of seeing two persons come forward and make the good confession. Two others followed on the next Lord's day. We have since succeeded in getting a more eligible hall for our meetings on Frankford avenue, and our first meeting in it was blessed by the addition of two more to the family of Christ.—Last evening we had a very large and very attentive audience, giving us good hope that the glorious work will receive a mighty impetus in this city, and that by the good pleasure of our God we shall be made the instruments in his hands of bringing many souls into his kingdom.

Yours in the Truth, D. CALDWELL,
D. STUMP,
T. C. F. SANDERS.

PHILADELPHIA.

OBITUARIES.

ELD. W. K. PENDLETON—*My dear Brother:*—We owe you an apology for not having conveyed to you sooner the sad intelligence of the death of your beloved niece, Mrs. JANE P. HUNTER, wife of John Hunter, Esq., and only daughter of our older brother, Joseph K. Pendleton. Her life for the past two years had been one of almost continual suffering, and the history of her case is simply the saddest that ever fell under my professional observation. Her health, which had hardly been firm for some time before, had so much failed about two years ago, as to excite the serious solicitude of her friends, and make medical treatment necessary; but despite the best medical aid she could command, about home and from abroad, her decline continued; and then, she spent

Digitized by Google

a year in New York City and on Staten Island, under the hospitable roof of her cousins, Mr. and Miss Barret, where she was under the constant care of the most eminent practitioners of that city. But to no purpose. At length, last spring, in almost utter despair of help from human aid, with a heart yearning for her own dear home, and hopeful only of a safe return and a peaceful re-union with the friends there she loved so well, she was brought, by easy stages, back to her father's house—worn and wearied by the journey—a helpless, hopeless invalid. But she was destined to suffer much more—and through many long days and nights of sleeplessness, to drag out an existence, at times of utter agony; and yet she bore it all most patiently, with a fortitude and Christian resignation almost superhuman. Her decline now, which had been very gradual, became less so. Her appetite began to fail, and then—her strength gave way, and we knew now the end was not distant. Of this she was herself fully conscious for some weeks before her death.

She had very naturally wished to live—for there are many joyous things in this world, and in the spring time of life, the young and hopeful heart will cherish a thousand bright dreams and visions of earthly happiness. But affliction had taught her how vain and illusive are all these hopes, and she had learned to realize that there was, at last, but *one Hope*, that would prove an anchor to her soul both sure and steadfast, and that blessed Hope she cherished with a firm and unwavering confidence to the last.

With a natural talent for music, and a heart attuned to sacred melodies, she loved to sing the songs of Zion, of—

> Beautiful Zion! built above,
> Beautiful city! that I love,

and she loved to talk of the blissful re-union there, with the many devoted friends who had so long watched and waited at her bedside, for the coming of that hour which would be her last. And now she began to sink more sensibly. She had lost much sleep—was nervous and needed anodynes; but she had an aversion for opium—perhaps a prejudice against it—and out of deference to her wishes, the *divine drug* was withheld. At length, from loss of sleep, her mind began to wander; and then she had convulsions; and these completely prostrated her. And so, on the evening of the 14th of January last, in the 29th year of her age, she fell asleep for the last time, in the blessed hope of a glorious resurrection.

P. B. P.

Cuckoo, Va., Feb. 10, 1870.

Died, at Bethany, W. V., Feb. 1st., Mrs. J. A. Hodges, aged 67 years, formerly of Danbury, Conn.

The deceased possessed an amiable temper, and her life was adorned by all those virtues which characterize the Christian from the worldling. She died rejoicing in the Lord, and now quietly sleeps in Jesus, there to slumber until the morning of the resurrection, when she shall be called to share the glories awaiting the redeemed in a brighter world.

> "Asleep in Jesus! O how sweet
> To be for such a slumber meet!
> With holy confidence to sing,
> That death has lost its venomed sting."

C. H. H.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$ 25	Extra Cloth, - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edg s - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, - -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. Va.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., MARCH, 1870. [No. III.

LETTERS FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

LETTER III.

INSPIRATION.

DEAR BRO. LOOS.—A very happy new year to you and all the dear brethren of the district—with increase of life and happiness from all the sacred fountains above and below. I have just finished reading the November No. of your Harbinger, which came to hand two days ago. It is decidedly the strongest of the year's issue; your own article on Hereditary Church Membership is all that could be desired, and Bro Pendleton has come out in great power on the Inspiration of the Scriptures. The Sermon by C. H. Richards, which Bro. Pendleton dissects so scientifically, is indeed a curiosity of rationalism—one of the rare jewels of unbelief fished up from the dead sea with great labor and small profit. As our enemy said when he undertook the foolish business of shearing swine, "much cry and little wool." If the very meaning of the word Prophet is "one who bubbles over," then Richards is himself a Prophet; but if the liquor in the cauldron be no better than the "bubbles" which come to the surface and froth over, the inspiration is of a very questionable order. Like most men of that very shallow school, he can see the "miracle of literature," the charm and glory of the Book. It is worth notice that men whose souls are steeped in the supernaturalism of the Record scarcely ever look in that direction, and certainly never get

Digitized by Google

up any raptures about the matter. They have but little time or heart to spend over the tracery and finish of the golden Pitchers, being far too busy drinking the wine of the higher life so copiously poured forth.

The rationalising orator speaks "of a collection of books written by forty different authors during a period of 1,600 years, the *natural outgrowth* of their deeply religious lives;" but the chief result, the main wonder of such work appears to have escaped him entirely. Even a slight inspection brings out the fact that the Books are bound into Unity by something stronger than packthread. We see in the Books the increasing purpose of God in the orderly development of a stupendous plan, which the writers never concerted, for they never met until their earthly work was finished. In story upon story the temple of the Holies, the City of God arises; the grand towers and battlements shine forth; and the great country of promise reveals its living landscapes. Our author's theory sheds no light on the strange fact that the elements contributed through the ages blend so harmoniously in one incorporation, that stones fashioned by diverse workmen in remote quarries, fit into one building. No amount of mental power and no amount of holiness can account for the final result. It is quite possible that Plato and Bacon were equal to Isaiah and Ezekiel in intellectual breadth; quite possible that Jung Stilling and Fletcher of Madely were equal to any of the Apostles in holiness; but none of these men were lifted above the house of nature, none of them transcended the visible, so as to bring us original tidings from God in positive revelation.

The loose ideas about inspiration which float among you, originated in our old country. Our Coleridge first broke the ground in his "Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit," and our Morrell finally supplemented him in a pretentious and pernicious book—"The Philosophy of Religion." But our Divines likewise caught the infection. Bishop Wilson, Dr. Pye Smith and others—all of most orthodox name began to distinguish the various kinds and degrees of inspiration; there was suggestion, *direction, elevation, superintendency;* I cannot remember the names of all the dry bones; but besides looking ghastly, when they were shaken, they made a terrible rattle, and many of us here after hearing lectures and reading dissertations of the kind, began to say with Mephistopheles that 'such thumping would never make a rattle.'—

Digitized by Google

When we began to post up our books it was found that the new scheme would leave scarcely any genuine inspiration. Whereas when we turn to the Book, we find that "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." This comprehends all the documents, whether the men spake of things which they knew historically, experimentally, or by immediate revelation. God alone knew what materials, in what proportion, and in what order the things should be delivered to the world as the testimony of Himself. Hence the entire Books were given by inspiration; and any attempt to distinguish kinds or degrees of inspiration is a very foolish business—to say nothing of its wickedness.

As an apology for the supposed blunders in the Holy Book we were called upon to observe—that the Bible was not given to teach man Science, Philosophy, Natural History or profane history, but to show man the way to the blessed life—to bring him back into union and communion with God, and give him victory over sin and death. All very true—but not to the purpose. If we found the sacred writers dealing in fabulous history, spurious science and false philosophy—how long would we trust them as guides in divinity? If they blundered all matters about the outer court, how could we rely upon them in the Holy of Holies? The man who knew not the road across the common near to his own house, would scarcely be chosen as a guide to conduct pilgrims to the Holy Land!

Then we were called upon to consider the diversity of style among the sacred writers, and there was a division made—the thought given to God and the form or fashion to man. This dualism was built on the foolish assumption that God could not make use of a man's style as well as of his being or nature. The fact is—that the thought as well as the style or fashion of each writer is preserved, and yet all is of God and from God. He sends his own documents into the world, through chosen instruments, without destroying any man's individuality. He has a thousand styles in nature, from the strong masonry of Alps or Andes to the ideal painting of the western sky and He gives us similar variety in Revelation.

I am often sick at heart not merely with the impious pretensions of Science, but even with its actual discoveries. Nature seems to me as inscrutable in the open day as in the solemn darkness. Eureka is often heard but when we run we find noth-

Digitized by Google

ing but figs. Our most powerful natural men scarcely penetrate even the shell of the visible. No man has yet been permitted to lift the vail, and behold the glories of the interior. Finding themselves baffled at every turning, the gates shut in their faces, and sometimes hollow laughter inside, our wise men begin to say that there is nothing concealed but rubbish. We were savages in the beginning descended from Baboon or Gorilla, and we are developed into a kind of demi-gods, and we shall in course of time be succeeded by some other mightier creatures.

How glorious after all the foundation documents in simplicity and in majesty. We find a true creation, as well as a true fashioning or making matter and form—material and kosmos—both from God. Then as to man, the Lord of the visible, God forms him from the earth and from Himself, so that he may feel his relation to God his Father and Nature his Mother. We see no degraded savage or developed monkey forsaking his order, but a new and crowning nature clothed in physical, mental and moral glories, as Ruler and Priest under God. A comparison of our documents either with the traditions of heathenism or with the wretched speculations of false science, is quite sufficient for a thoughtful man. Such a person soon distinguishes the authentic voice of the Lord, and beholds the light of his countenance.

The Spaniards cannot get a king, and the Council at Rome requires a President to keep order and see fair play; could you not find *two* strong men on your side of the Pool who would pay their own traveling expenses? The first must not be afraid of fire or revolution, and the second must be able to speak and understand some kind of Latin. Should it be corrupt and barbarous, it will not be an absolute disqualification.

But I find that my letter is getting too long. So with love to all the dear brethren, I remain, dear Bro. Loos,

Your affectionate brother, G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, Jan. 4, 1870.

LETTER IV.—INSPIRATION, CONTINUED.

DEAR BRO. LOOS:—The question of Inspiration, which I merely glanced at in my last letter, led me to muse on the strength of man in some directions, and his weakness in others. There is a magnificent chapter in the Book of Job, which expounds in fine contrast human power and human limitations. Man, the

Digitized by Google

earth-god, has immense resources of inventive genius and great power over the visible, both in discovery and in new combinations. With his lamp of reason burning strong and clear, he cleaves asunder the earth and brings its hidden riches to light.—The iron, the brass, the silver, the gold, and the precious stones, which burn like fire in secret places, are all brought to the surface, for service or pleasure, for utility or glory. He binds the floods from overflowing, or cuts out rivers among the rocks; he setteth an end to darkness and searcheth out all perfection.

But this lord of the visible, with all his great forces, mechanical and chemical—with his genius in discovery and application, in analysis and synthesis—is after all strangely limited. With all his knowledge and power, he cannot without supernatural aid discover the *true wisdom* or find the mystic path which leads into everlasting life. Of what avail to him his stones of light and fire, his pillars of iron and brass, his spacious rivers and great bridges, his houses and couches of cedar and ivory lined with silver and gold, if he has no inward life in the midst of material glories and triumphs, and if at last death covers him with dust and leaves him without hope.

There is a wonderful road which the wheeling eagle never saw from the rocks or the air, which the lion never found in the solitudes of the forest. The sea saith, 'it is not in me,' and the depth saith, 'it is not with me.' Destruction and death say, 'we have heard the fame thereof with our ears;' that is all they know—and all they wish to know—for the rumor threatens their dominions. The Being who originally made a way for the lightning of the thunder, likewise determined and set this path in order and lifted man into it by immediate help; otherwise man would have been wretched and hopeless in the midst of all his splendid materialisms and mental victories, and death with darkness deeper, would have covered him and his works with shame and everlasting contempt.

There is a chapter in 2 Cor. equally remarkable in its way with the xxviii. of Job—and substantially in the same direction.—Among the perfect the Apostles spake the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the hidden wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory. Which none of the Princes of this world knew, for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory. But as it is written, 'Eye hath not seen nor

Digitized by Google

ear heard neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.' The closing verse is generally quoted to prove that the glories of our final inheritance are inconceivable. This, however true in itself, is certainly not the special truth enunciated by the Apostle—for it is immediately added, 'but God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God.' The passage places before us Man the natural in relation to the visible. His senses and intellect are in exquisite adaptation to the arrangements of nature. The visible building is to him dwelling-house, work-shop, and picture gallery. It contains chambers for comfort and convenience, tools and materials for labor and experiment, paintings which make and nourish wonder and idealism. Besides—if the observer has already faith in the existence of a Personal Creator, the visible evidence shows forth the eternal power and God-head. But after all—how cabined and cribbed would man be shut up as a prisoner in the visible. The temple would be a jail. With no tidings save from Nature, we would not pronounce with certainty concerning the moral character of God. Nor could we learn anything conclusive respecting the destinies of man. The blowing winds, eastern or western, bring no authentic tidings of reconciliation with God.—The wilderness of suns on high sheds no light on the mysteries of moral evil, or the darkness of the grave. Redemption is not inscribed on any of the mountain-walls. Neither the fathomless sea nor any of the rejoicing rivers, have a word concerning restoration of the divine nature or victory over death in immortal beauty, and eternal communion with the Father of our spirits. Hence it is impossible for man under purely natural conditions to see with his eyes, or hear with his ears, or conceive with his understanding—for the sights, sounds, and objects are not in the visible.

These things have been brought to us by the Revealing Spirit in the mind of Christ, and faith in such testimony is the Chariot by which we escape the prison, transcend nature and soar into a finer country. The contest confirms this view. Man so far from having ability to search the mind of God, cannot even search the mind of his own mate or fellow beside him in the workshop. Unless that mate reveal himself by his words he remains inscrutable to his companion. Much less can we scale the

Digitized by Google

heavens, or open the abysmal Book of the divine mind to read the records of destiny. Blessed be the God who has SPOKEN, and not in accents of wrath but with tidings of victorious love and everlasting life. The forgiveness of sin, the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, the transformation of the vile body the transfiguration of nature, the splendors of the City of God—all the grand realities of the present and the future—are ours by the abundance of his grace

There is one statement in the chapter which brings the Inspiration question close to us. "Which things also we speak, not in the *words* which man's wisdom teacheth but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." Unquestionbly this comprehends the style or expression no less than the ideas—the words are included as well as the things. We are *not* taught that God supplied the substantial matter of revelation and that man supplied the vesture, apparel or fashion. But we *are* taught that matter and form, substance and style, things and words, were equally from God. Divine truth—the realities of the kingdom—come to us not in words taught by human wisdom, but in words taught by the Holy Spirit. "Comparing spiritual things with spiritual" is rather an obscure rendering of one clause in the chapter. "Explaining spiritual things in spiritual words," is perhaps worse; for separate from the meaning which may be conveyed, there are no spiritual words, no heavenly vocabulary. Prophets and apostles infallibly guided by the Spirit employed the common words of the languages prevailing as vehicles of the divine ideas. The substance of the matter is, that the things of the Spirit come to us in the words of the Spirit.

Since I last wrote, the Bishop of Bosnia has been thundering in the Council at Rome against the Order of the Jesuits, and exposing most forcibly their wicked machinations. He is reported as a man of commanding power, and a great master of Latinity. It appears that the slaves and tools of the Pope are not to have all their own way.

My own impression is, that the next Pope will be the last.—The iron has been stricken deeply into the heart and vitals of Superstition, as the revolt among the nations makes manifest. It is not the mysterious drunken woman which we have now to dread, but rather that red Beast which carries her for a little season, while the fires of ruin are kindling.

Digitized by Google

The advancing power in Europe, and even in America, is Atheistic rather than superstitious. The millions are everywhere breaking loose from supernatural moorings, and drifting toward the black sea of utter denial—the gulf which is godless.

But we know in whom we have believed, and we know that the fierce blaspheming powers will be short-lived—the phantoms of a day—storming on to their perdition: and we know that our own King will come into the field in the seasonable time with power divine and irresistible.

I am, dear Bro. Loos, faithfully yours, G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, Eng., Jan. 10th, 1870.

PHYSICAL AND METAPHYSICAL SCIENCE.

Whenever two separate and distinct methods of investigation approach simultaneously the same question with a determination to solve it, they are almost sure to meet, not in—an entirely possible—friendly examination, but in a more or less open hostility. Each deeming the problem peculiarly its own, maintains the examination of it by the other is not only of no use, but is positively an interference. And so swords are crossed in an enterprise in which cooperation is worth infinitely more than the stimulus which comes from opposition; and in which too the united strength of the force employed would no more than suffice for its successful accomplishmeut. Thus it is in the investigations of Physics and Metaphysics. The former, obeying to the full the injunction to subdue the earth, has pushed its investigations into every department of natural phenomena with a success truly wonderful. Naturally elated, it jumps at once to the conclusion that all phenomena are but one in essence, and hence are to be interpreted by the same rules which it has already used to so good purpose in a single department. Hence it boldly buckles on its armor and dashes with its old lance at an enemy of quite another sort. It would fain solve the problems of mind and spirit by applying to them the laws of matter. But here Metapyhsics meets it; metaphysics, progressive, perhaps, but with a tottering uncertain step. Claiming that the laws of mind are to be studied only in the inner consciousness, she rebukes the intruder for presuming to apply there the tests of physical science, and or-

Digitized by Google

ders him away. High words pass. "Infidel," "materialist," shouts Metaphysics; "Bigot," "dogmatist," retorts Physics; and at once the tournament begins, and a problem so complex as to offer abundant opportunity for both sorts of investigation, becomes the battle-ground on which rivals fight for the supremacy, while the progress of the truth is forgotten.

Now, what is the fault here? Precisely that of which we have above spoken; the error lies in the assumption that the same great problem cannot be successfully investigated by two widely different methods. Its very existence betrays, on both sides, a belief that disagreement necessarily betokens antagonism. The old adage that truth is many-sided is forgotten, each maintaining all conclusions false, not in complete accord with its own. But surely, workers in so different fields must make the most careful comparisons before their work can even be judged of by each other, much less declared discordant. This can only be done by a parley; a flag of truce must stop hostilities, the contending parties must agree upon terms, must establish peace. Then, sharply defining the province which each is to investigate, let each enter vigorously upon its work. Let Physical science study the anatomy and functions of the brain, that mysterious organ of the mind; let her trace its delicate fibers and measure the changes it undergoes in evolving thought, viewed as a peculiar force-manifestation. Let Metaphysics consider the workings of mind, in its triple relation. Let her study the origin and character of ideas and classify the wondrous faculties of the human intellect. And when both have filled up their measure of truth, then will it be found that each has but supplemented the other; both have furnished hemispheres; each unlike, it may be, the other, and even opposite to it; but yet both exactly fitted to each other and together completing the rounded sphere of truth.

But where are these boundary lines to be drawn? What are the limits within which the assertions of Physical science on the one hand, or of Metaphysical science on the other, are to be regarded as absolute and to be conceded indisputable? This dividing line must of course be run by mutual agreement. Each must concede that its conclusions in the territory of the other are worthless, and hence fix the line where they cease to be of value. For physical science, this line has been clearly laid down by that prince of physicists, John Tyndall. And since the ques-

Digitized by Google

tion is one of great and immediate importance, we will offer no apology for quoting a portion of his argument; only regretting that our space will not allow us to give the whole. It is found in his address to the Physical section of the British Association, at its meeting in August, 1868, on "The Tendencies and Limits of Modern Science." After describing the picture which we may conjure up at pleasure, of the toilers who built the Pyramids, and remarking that by the eye of science the forces which place each molecule in position to form a crystal of common salt are quite as easily perceived, he carries the analogy a step further to a grain of wheat, the molecules of which are arranged by the force of life. We quote: "Now there is nothing in this process which necessarily eludes the power of mind as we know it. An intellect the same in kind as our own, would, if only sufficiently expanded, be able to follow the whole process from beginning to end. No entirely new intellectual faculty would be needed for the purpose. The duly expanded mind would see in this process and its consummation, an instance of the play of molecular force. It would see every molecule placed in its position by the specific attractions and repulsions exerted between it and other molecules.—Nay, given the grain and its environment, an intellect the same in kind as our own, but sufficiently expanded, might trace out *a priori* every step of the process, and by the application of mechanical principles would be able to demonstrate that the cycle of actions must end, as it is seen to end, in the reproduction of forms like that with which the operation began. A similar necessity rules here to that which rules the planets in their circuits round the sun.

"You will notice that I am stating my truth strongly as at the beginning we agreed it should be stated. But I must go still further, and affirm that in the eye of science the animal body is just as much the product of molecular force as the stalk and ear of corn, or as the crystal of salt or sugar. Many of its parts are obviously mechanical. Take the human heart, for example, with its exquisite system of valves, or take the eye or the hand. Animal heat moreover, is the same in kind as the heat of a fire, being produced by the same chemical process. Animal motion too, is as directly derived from the food of the animal, as the motion of Trevethyck's walking engine from the fuel in its furnace. As regards matter, the animal body creates nothing; as regards force,

Digitized by Google

it creates nothing. Which of you by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature? All that has been said regarding the plant may be restated with regard to the animal. Every particle that enters into the composition of the muscle, a nerve, or a bone, has been placed in its position by molecular force. And unless the existence of law in these matters be denied and the element of caprice be introduced, we must conclude that, given the relation of any molecule of the body to its environment, its position in the body might be predicted. Our difficulty is not with the quality of the problem, but with its complexity; and this difficulty might be met by the simple expansion of the faculties which man now possesses. Given this expansion, and given the necessary molecular data, and the chick might be deduced as rigorously and as logically from the egg, as the existence of Neptune was deduced from the disturbances of Uranus, or as conical refraction was deduced from the undulatory theory of light.

"You see I am not mincing matters, but avowing nakedly what many scientific thinkers more or less distinctly believe.—The formation of a crystal, a plant, or an animal, is in their eyes a purely mechanical problem, which differs from the problems of ordinary mechanics in the smallness of the masses and the complexity of the processes involved. Here you have one-half of our dual truth; let us now glance at the other half. Associated with this wonderful mechanism of the animal body, we have phenomena no less certain than those of physics, but between which and the mechanism we discern no necessary connection. A man, for example, can say I feel, I think, I love; but how does consciousness infuse itself into the problem? The human brain is said to be the organ of thought and feeling; when we are hurt the brain feels it, when we ponder it is the brain that thinks, when our passions or affections are excited, it is through the instrumentality of the brain. Let us endeavor to be a little more precise here. I hardly imagine that any profound scientific thinker who has reflected upon the subject exists, who would not admit the extreme probability of the hypothesis, that for every fact of consciousness, whether in the domain of sense, of thought, or of emotion, a certain definite molecular condition is set up in the brain; that this relation of physics to consciousness is invariable, so that, given the state of the brain, the corresponding thought or feeling may be inferred; or, given the thought or feel-

Digitized by Google

ing, the corresponding state of the brain might be inferred. But how inferred? It is at bottom not a case of logical inference at all, but of empirical association. You may reply that many of the inferences of science are of this character; the inference, for example, that an electric current of a given direction will deflect a magnetic needle in a definite way; but the cases differ in this, that the passage from the current to the needle, if not demonstrable, is thinkable, and that we entertain no doubt as to the final mechanical solution of the problem; but the passage from the physics of the brain to the corresponding facts of consciousness is unthinkable. Granted that a definite thought and a definite molecular action in the brain occur simultaneously we do not possess the intellectual organ, nor, apparently, any rudiment of the organ which would enable us to pass by a process of reasoning from the one phenomenon to the other. They appear together but we do not know why. Were our minds and senses so expanded, strengthened, and illuminated, as to enable us to see and feel the very molecules of the brain; were we capable of following all their motions, all their groupings, all their electric discharges, if such there be; and were we intimately acquainted with the corresponding states of thought and feeling, we should be as far as ever from the solution of the problem, 'How are these physical processes connected with the facts of consciousness?' The chasm between the two classes of phenomena would still remain intellectually impassable. Let the consciousness of love, for example, be associated with a right-handed spiral motion of the molecules of the brain, and the consciousness of hate with a left-handed spiral motion. We should then know when we love that the motion is in one direction, and when we hate, that the motion is in the other; but the '*why*' would still remain unanswered.

"In affirming that the growth of the body is mechanical, and that thought as exercised by us, has its correlative in the physics of the brain, I think the position of the "Materialist" is stated as far as that position is a tenable one. I think the materialist will be able finally to maintain this position against all attacks; but I do not think, as the human mind is at present constituted, that he can pass beyond it. I do not think he is entitled to say that his molecular groupings and his molecular motions explain every thing. In reality they explain nothing. The utmost he can affirm

Digitized by Google

is the association of two classes of phenomena, of whose real bond of union he is in absolute ignorance. The problem of the connection of the body and soul is as insoluble in its modern form as it was in the pre-scientific ages. Phosphorus is known to enter into the composition of the human brain, and a courageous writer has exclaimed in his trenchant German, "Ohne phosphor kein gedanke." That may or may not be the case; but even if we knew it to be the case the knowledge would not lighten our darkness. On both sides of the zone here assigned to the materialist, he is equally helpless. If you ask him whence is this "matter" of which we have been discoursing, who or what divided it into molecules, who or what impressed upon them the necessity of running into organic forms, he has no answer. Science also is mute in reply to these questions. But if the materialist is confounded and science rendered dumb, who else is entitled to answer? To whom has this secret been revealed? Let us lower our heads and acknowledge our ignorance, one and all. Perhaps the mystery may resolve itself into knowledge at some future day.—The process of things upon this earth has been one of amelioration. It is a long way from the Iguanodon and his contemporaries to the president and members of the British Association.—And whether we regard the improvement from the scientific or from the theological point of view, as the result of progressive development or as the result of successive exhibitions of creative energy, neither view entitles us to assume that man's present faculties end the series—that the process of amelioration stops at him. A time may therefore come when this ultra-scientific region by which we are now enfolded may offer itself to terrestiral, if not to human, investigation. Two-thirds of the rays emitted by the sun fail to arouse in the eye the sense of vision. The rays exist but the visual organ requisite for their translation into light does not exist. And so from this region of darkness and mystery which surrounds us, rays may now be darting which require but the development of the proper intellectual organs to translate them into knowledge as far surpassing ours as ours does that of the wallowing reptiles which once held posession of this planet. Meanwhile the mystery is not without its uses. It certainly may be made a power in the human soul; but it is a power which has feeling, not knowledge, for its base. It may be, and will be, and we hope is, turned to account, both in steadying and strengthen-

Digitized by Google

ing the intellect, and in rescuing man from that littleness, to which, in the struggle for existence or for precedence in the world, he is continually prone."

We now look for a corresponding statement from an equally representative metaphysician. A statement which shall concede as much to physics as Tyndall's does to metaphysics; which shall admit the right of science to investigate mental phenomena, and shall define its own province therein.—*College Courant.*

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

We live in a most eventful, if not portentous, period of the world's history. What strange, surpassing strange events have transpired within the last few years. Within the last decade we have seen most of the States of Europe disenthralled from a state of political and religious bondage. Freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press, have in a large measure taken the place of a political and spiritual tyranny that had for ages overspread like a pall the nations of Europe. We have seen the darkness of a cruel and pernicious Superstition contrived and sustained by a corrupt and apostate hierarchy of gigantic dimensions, dwindle down in a few years to the humblest proportions. And we see at this hour the Head of a great spiritual Despotism in great agony suffering from a spiritual paralysis, summoning to his aid, by way of consultation, the most skillful and distinguished orders of his hierarchy from all parts of his dominions.

As spiritual advisers called to examine his case, they pronounce it one of great danger. They agreed that his ability to wield the scepter could not be restored—that it was irrecoverably gone.—And with respect to the power of wielding the miter they disagreed. The most skillful regarded his power in this respect seriously impaired. They were, however, in the minority in regarding his claim to infallibility as a species of mental or spiritual imbecility. The majority regarded his weakness in this respect as rather functional than organic.

But to drop the figurative style. Is it not most ominous of the beginning of the end of this spiritual despotism that neither the Cardinals nor the Bishops would unanimously endorse the Infal-

Digitized by Google

libility of His Holiness? But as is usual in religious reforms, the clergy are greatly behind the laity; it is so in this instance. What is the lesson so lately taught us by those surprising revolutions of the Catholic States of Europe, touching the faith of the Church in the Infallibility of its Head? Were not these potentates as sons of the church infallibly certain that in establishing those new and liberal governments which granted to Protestant sects most perfect freedom of worship, they must incur the displeasure of his Holiness? Would they have admitted his claim to infallibility and have done this? Certainly not. Otherwise, they would have feared to incur his anathema. Or would those sovereigns and their ministers, think you, endorse those twenty-one canons so recently published in the Pall Mall Gazette, and continue their defiant attitude toward the Pope? If his Holiness be infallible, they are certainly the accursed of God.

If those new and liberal governments established by Roman Catholic Princes prove anything clearly, it is that their founders have no faith in the infallibility of Pio Nono.

But the signs of the times are not all to be seen upon European soil. Nearer home, in free, enlightened North America, in its great Republic, the envy and glory of all lands, where we have free soil, free thought, free speech, free action, free institutions, and above all free schools instituted by a free people to secure their children against all despotisms, spiritual, ecclesiastic, and political,—even here, in the enjoyment of all this freedom, what have we seen? We have seen a most audacious attempt on the part of that same corrupt Hierarchy to establish itself upon our free soil, that if possible it may here regain the power it has irrecoverably lost in the Old Word. By a bold stroke of Jesuitical policy, it has within the last year succeeded through the venality of some corrupt politicians, in putting its stealthy hand into the public school treasury of the City and State of New York and abstracting therefrom under false pretenses, a sum not far from half-a-million of dollars. And all this for the purpose of educating their children to hate and revile, and if possible, to aid them to subvert and destroy our free, prosperous and happy Republic. We hail, upon the whole, this opposition and hostility to our free schools as most timely. It is one of the most remarkable signs of the times. The institution of the free school system is so evidently in the right direction, and so clearly indicates a nation's progress

Digitized by Google

in that which must eventually constitute its true greatness and glory, that we need not marvel that such progress should excite the envy and hatred of those who foreseeing the result, see nothing but defeat in what to the true patriot and philanthropist must prove a great success. We therefore care not that the institution of free schools has proved a mark of contradiction. It has already revealed the hearts of many of those whom we had mistaken for the true friends of their race.

We can now understand our neighbors better, and shall be less liable to misplace confidence, which is always unpleasant and often detrimental to us.

It is then one of the signs in our political heavens from which we might do well to take our reckoning for guiding our ship of State. We have yet an open sea, propitious gales, and beacons not a few to betoken approaching danger. Let us then, see to it that we have true men at the helm, that should storms arise and she be tossed upon the billows that threaten to dash her upon the breakers, she may be able to ride the storm, and reach the desired haven in peace and safety. A. W. C.

THE DEACON'S OFFICE.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—The Harbinger for January contains some remarks by you in answer to one T. H. S., who asks your views on the Deacon's office. This querist uses my name, which stands at the head of what you have written in reply. You make no direct allusion to me, but your response was evidently intended to refute my denial. Had T. H. S. sent his request without my name, it would have excited no special interest on my part; but, as the matter now stands, I feel called on to reply. The spirit of your remarks is very kind, and I will endeavor to be equally generous in what I write. When you read my scribbling, do as you think best about giving it a place in your paper. You are no doubt well aware that brethren older and more capable than myself entertain a similar view on this subject to the one your correspondent tells you has been avowed by me.

You give two definitions of deacon,—one official and the other common or primary. You say: "The term deacon, as an official designation, was transferred to the Christian church from the Jewish synagogue." Was this transfer made by Christ and the

Digitized by Google

apostles, or by uninspired men since their time? As I find no account of such transaction in the New Testament, my conclusion is that it was not done by divine authority. But why should we rely on analogy of the Jewish system to prove an *office* in the church of Christ, when we have uniformly rejected the same kind of argument to prove infant church membership? Concerning the other meaning, you remark: "The term deacon, in its common acceptation, means simply minister; as Minister of God, Minister of the Gospel, &c.; so that in its official sense, if it have one, we must look for its meaning out of its simple and primary definition." You seem, in the sentence just quoted, to use the word deacon for, or as the equivalent of, the Greek word *diakonos*, from which it is translated. Then if the common meaning of *diakonos* is minister, we should have a good reason for so doing, before we translate it by any other word into English. The parenthetic clause you insert into the language I am now commenting on, seems to manifest doubt in your own mind concerning this word's having any official designation. 'Minister' will translate *diakonos* in every one of its thirty occurrences in the Greek New Testament, and the context will generally show unmistakably what kind of minister is referred to. Deacons has as many official meanings in English, as there are Churches in which it is used as an official designation. For proof of this, refer to Webster's Dictionary. *Diakonos*, as a Greek word, can not possibly contain all the meanings that deacon does, as an English word; and I do not believe it contains *any* of the *official meanings* now attached to the latter. In the Christian Quarterly for April, page 256, I find the following translation and remarks, in an article from the pen of our esteemed brother Dr. S. E. Shepherd: "Paul and Timothy, servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus who are at Philippi, with *overseers* and *ministers*. Phil. i. 1 There is no more reason, why the word *(diakonois)* should be translated deacons here, than there is for translating it by the same word in all the places in which it is found in all the Epistles. It is first assumed that there was an order of men in the primitive church called deacons, and then this assumption is made a reason for this rendering of the word. That there was a class of men called ministers is admitted. But there there was no class answerable to the order of deacons. The same is true of 1 Timothy iii. 8, 12."

Digitized by Google

I sm a little surprised at the eourse you take to prove such an office as deacon. T. H. S. tells you, that my denial is, that the *original* language teaches such office; and yet, you only quote the English of 1 Tim. 3rd, and then say: "In this passage it is ex- expressly taught that this is an *office*, since the performance of his work is called the performance of the office of a deacon; but whilst we are informed as to his religious and moral qualifications, nothing is specifically said of his duties." Of course the *English* teaches it, but the translation is the thing of which I doubt the correctness. It occurs to me you ought to have told the English reader that the two clauses, "*Let them exercise the office of a deacon*," and "*Who have performed the office of a deacon*," is each one translated from the single word *diakoneo;* and then have given him good reasons to sustain the translation. Let the English reader look at these two sentences in italics, and ask himself if he would suppose either of them translated from a single word. My Latin New Testament has the single word *ministro*, from which we get our English verb to minister, as the representative of *diakoneo* here. The English reader, no doubt, supposes there is a word here in the Greek for *office*, which is not the case. Definitions of *diakoneo* equivalent to the above italicised clauses are found in Lexicons of the Greek New Testament, but they are secondary meanings and have sprung up from use since the days of the apostles. We reject such meanings in the case of baptizo and insist on the primary meaning. Why not do the same in this case. I deny that such meaning as deacon's office, as we understand it, or as understood in any other ecclesiastical establishment, is contained in *diakoneo*. If we should translate *diakoneo* in 1 Tim. iii. 10, 13, by its primary meaning, *to minister*, any one can see where the office of deacon would go. Yet to do this, it seems to me, would be to carry out the same principle we have all the time contended for in the case of baptizo. If these ministers should turn out to be ministers of the Gospel, or evangelists, it occurs to me their qualifications are better described than those of our deacons.

Since *diakonos* is applied to almost all classes of officials spoken of in the New Testament, and *diakonia* is used to designate their work, I have often wondered how we could tell that persons to whom these are applied are *official deacons*. If your meaning is comprehended by me, you have given us the rule. You say in your

Digitized by Google

comment on Acts 6th: "This is an important passage; for although the seven were not called deacons, yet the office they were to perform was *diakonia* (Deaconship); as they acted, in its discharge, by a solemn official appointment, there can be no doubt of the propriety of denominating them official deacons."—Then if persons acted by a solemn official appointment and the office they performed was called *diakonia*, we can, without doubt, call them official deacons. Let us try this rule.—Take Timothy as an example. 1st. He acted by solemn official appointment. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of hands by the presbytery." 1 Tim. iv. 14. 2. His office was called *diakonia* [deaconship]. "But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry [diakonia or deaconship]. 2 Tim. iv. 5. 3. He was called *diakonos* or deacon, "If thou put the brethren in remembrance of these things, thou shalt be a good minister [*diakonos*] of Jesus Christ." 1 Tim. iv. 6. Now, I have one more point in evidence to prove Timothy an official deacon than you have to prove the seven such, that is, he was *called* a deacon. Would you then, without doubt, call this supposed evangelist an official deacon? If you would not, then, it seems to me, your rule is faulty. Were not the seven spoken of in Acts 6th extraordinary ministers? The circumstances were certainly such as we have no account of afterward; nor do we have any account of persons selected to do such duty again. How can they have successors unless another community of goods should furnish the occasion to call them out? It is assumed, that because these men were appointed to serve or wait at tables, they had charge of the whole temporal affairs of the congregation. The text does not inform us that they raised, disbursed or had anything whatever to do with money.

In the following quotation you partially admit that the service these men were appointed to do was not a permanent one.—"Still, the specific object for which these seven were appointed is all that we are taught as to the duties of the order. This was the daily ministration, which the Apostles afterwards explained to mean the waiting or attending at tables; a service peculiar to the days of a community of goods, and, therefore, no longer needed in the church in this sense. Yet, as the church still has its funds, raised by the weekly contribution, for the assistance

Digitized by Google

and support of the poor, who *are always with us*, she still has need of this office, specifically for the same purpose." But, Bro. Pendleton, does it follow, that an appointment to serve tables under extraordinary circumstances, would include the duty of raising and disbursing the money of the church in a normal condition? If the duty of raising and expending the funds of the congregation was not included in the duty of the seven, how shall we take them as our model in that particular. But if any one affirms that these men had control of the funds, and actually did expend the money to furnish the tables at which they served, let him furnish the proof. The following will show, that when money was collected for the relief of the poor it was put into the hands of the *Elders*. "Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea. Which also they did and sent it to the Elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." Acts xi. 29. 30. Why should not the Elders or overseers control the funds of the church, and also wait on the brethren at the Lord's supper, rather than assume a class of officers whose existence, in the Apostolic church, cannot be shown. I presume the Elders may lay under contribution every class of talent in the congregation over which they preside; but is that a good reason for designating by such official titles as Clerk or Deacon, those who perform such minor duties as writing church letters, or buying consumables for the meeting house?

But if the seven spoken of in Acts 6th are allowed to have been official deacons, under the supposition that every church should have such officers, why is there no account of their having been appointed in any other church during Apostolic times than that of Jerusalem? The account of ordaining Elders is very full.—Why should not that of ordaining deacons be equally so? In Eph. iv. 11, 12, we have a catalogue of church officers given in detail, but in that list are found no deacons. The gifts Christ gave to men are apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers. The object for which they were given is threefold,—the perfecting of the saints, the work of the ministry, *(eis ergon diakonias)* and the edifying of the body of Christ. You will see from the matter in parenthesis that one of these gifts, at least according to your translation, was given for the work of the Deaconship.—Will you please tell me which one? Your answer might give us

Digitized by Google

the key that will unlock the difficulty in 1 Tim. 3. I will make no comment on the office of Deaconess. It will stand or fall by the arguments which support or overthrow that of deacon. I close by assuring you that the foregoing has been penned with the greatest reverence for both yourself and all the brethren older and more scholarly than myself, who have taken opposite ground. I have no special anxiety on the subject. If my positions are true they will, in time, be received. If they are false I want them exposed. JOHN C. MILLER.

NINEVEH, IND., Feb. 1870.

REPLY.

DEAR BRO. MILLER:—I introduce your strictures on my article with pleasure, not only because your name was referred to in the query which I attempted to answer, but because of the intrinsic merit of the argument which you make against the generally received conviction, that the order of 'deacon' in the Christian church is warranted by the Scriptures. I am aware, as you suppose, that others have taken a similar view; yet, so far as this goes, it must be conceded that, the weight of opinion being admitted as a criterion, the odds are almost infinitely against your view. But few hold it at all, and among that few, it will be hard to point out any names that rank high among scholars, on questions of this kind.

In reply to my statement that the term 'deacon,' as an official title, was transferred to the Christian church from the Jewish synagogue, you ask, "Was this done by the authority of Christ, or his apostles?" I answer, not by any formal and explicit statute, certainly, but nevertheless, by a process which is easily recognized and acknowledged. We find the term 'elders' used in the New Testament without any definition. Literally it means an 'old man,' but in the organization of the synagogue it had an 'official meaning;' and when we find it used also in an official sense in the organization of the Christian church, we say, and with propriety, that as an official title it is transferred to the Christian church from the Jewish synagogue. So with the official title of 'deacon.' There can be no doubt that the antecedent training and customs of the Jews were largely respected in the transfer of government from the Jewish synagogue to the Chris-

Digitized by Google

tian church, and that many terms and details of order and government were transferred to the one, which had been used in the organization and management of the other. And when we see officers, in the very first necessity of the apostolic church, formally separated for the discharge of duties which were almost identical with those which had been long assigned to certain officers in the Jewish synagogue, we may justly say, that the one furnished the model of the other. Of course this does not preclude the introduction of such modifications in the office as the peculiar spirit and genius of the new institution would require.

You say the word 'deacon' has as many official meanings in English, as there are different churches, but that the Greek can not have all these. This is perfectly true, but it is not peculiar to this word. Is it not also true of *baptizo?* Different churches attach different meanings to this word: yet this does not prove that it has not a definite meaning in the usage of Scripture. So with the word 'elder.' With some, it indicates the same official title as 'bishop'; with others, it is a generic term for 'bishops' and 'deacons' both. With others again, it indicates a rank inferior to the 'bishop;' whilst there is still another class who contend, as you do about 'deacon,' that it simply means an 'old man,' and has no official signification at all. Evidently these facts show, that we can reach no just conclusion on our subject in this way. Suppose that the official meaning of 'deacon' is a 'secondary' meaning; is not the same true of the official meaning of the words 'apostle,' 'evangelist,' 'elder,' and indeed of almost every word employed to indicate office? We must look to the question of *fact*, and not to that of *etymology*. Even *baptizo*, *might* have been used in a 'secondary' sense, and *is* sometimes so used by metonomy of the effect for the cause. When it is so used is a question to be determined by applying the established principles of criticism in each case. And so with the word 'deacon.'

You take the ground that the word *diakonos* is not used in the New Testament in the sense of 'performing the office of a deacon,' and insist on adhering to the primary meaning, 'to minister.' But is it not clear that the word *diakonous*, translated 'deacons,' signifies officers of some sort? It is placed in immediate relation to 'bishops,' and the apostle, after describing the qualifications of these latter officers, proceeds to describe the qualifications of the former. 'The deacons,' here, cannot be mere pri-

Digitized by Google

vate members of the church. They are officers, and the service or *ministering* which they were to do was *official* and not *private* service. As deacons, they must first be proved, and then *diakonate*, that is do, not any kind of private service, but the work of deacons—or perform the functions of the office. The verb *diakoneo* is used in what grammarians call a 'pregnant sense.' To its primary and general meaning of 'to minister,' there is added, by the force of its relation to the word *deacon*—used in its official sense, the idea of '*official use*,' and all thorough scholars, perhaps without respectable exception, and apart from any theory on the subject, so understand it. The Latin word '*ministro*' has the same force, and even were we to translate by the word '*minister*' in English, we would still have to understand it as official service. The translation is good, therefore, and would not be sufficiently explicit were we to change it to the general sense of '*to minister.*'

That this word 'diakonias' is used in an official sense in the Scriptures, is further proved by the address of the Epistle to the Philippians. It says, "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Here 'all the saints' are distinguished from 'bishops and deacons.' Why is this, but that the former are private members, and the latter officers? That 'bishops' were officers but few will deny,—is it not equally clear that 'deacons' were also? But if officers what was their office? You intimate that they were evangelists or ministers of the word. You say, 'If these ministers (diakonoi) should turn out to be ministers of the gospel, or evangelists, it occurs to me (you) their qualifications are better described than those of our deacons.' I understand you to mean that the qualifications described in 1 Tim. iii. 10, 13, agree better with the official duties of evangelists, than with those of our deacons. Perhaps if you had made a fair analysis, before you accepted this general conclusion, you would have found reason to think differently. Let us see.—The deacons must be *grave.* Does not this suit their office of ministering to the poor—the sick and the needy? Not double tongued: Does not this suit well the deacon's office, as dealing with the most intimate and delicate social and family affairs of the church? Not given to much wine, not greedy of filthy lucre: Are not these specifically appropriate qualifications, for those who minister at tables—and attend to the finances and charities of the

Digitized by Google

church? Holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience: This, again, is the spiritual basis of all fidelity and heartiness in a deacon's service. On the contrary—not one of these qualifications refers to the great and peculiar work of an evangelist. I need not enter into detail to prove this, to one so well acquainted with the pastoral epistles as you are, but I commend you to read with care again, and with this idea before you, the letters to Timothy and Titus,—and I am sure you will agree with me, that the qualifications prescribed for 'deacons' do not at all meet the requirements for such duties as are laid upon evangelists. There is not a word said about ability to preach, or teach—and these are among the most distinguishing qualifications of evangelists.

You ask, why is there no account of deacons having been appointed in any other church during Apostolic times, than that of Jerusalem? I can only conjecturally tell why. They are spoken of as existing, and the reason why there are no special accounts given of their appointment is not given; but it may have been, either that the office was deemed a subordinate one, or that the apostles and evangelists, as a general thing, only ordained the elders, and then left them to prove and ordain the deacons.—The ordination of deacons would, therefore, not be a fact so directly connected with apostolic labors as to come legitimately into the history. By the way are you not mistaken in saying that the account of ordaning elders is very full? We have, I think, only two allusions made to it in the New Testament—that in Acts 14. 23, and that in Titus i. 5; and if as I suppose, and as is very probable, the apostles and evangelists did not generally ordain deacons, but left that for the elders to do, we can very readily understand, why, in the two cases where the ordination of elders is spoken of, there should be no mention made of the ordination of deacons.

In the catalogue of officers given in Eph. iv. 11, 12, we could not expect to find deacons, because they were not essential to the ends for which these officers were given. I need not tell so good a logician as you, that it would have been altogether out of place to have named among a list of officers specially designed for purposes which are specifically stated, a class of officers having no relation to these purposes. Equally unwarranted would it be to translate *diakonia* 'deaconship,' when not used in especial refer-

Digitized by Google

ence to the office or work of a deacon. I have abundantly showed that the words *diakonos* and *diakonia* have a common or unofficial meaning, and that such cases should not be confounded with those in which they are used in their strictly official sense. So, when Paul says to Timothy, "Do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy *ministry*," we cannot understand *ministry* (diakonia) in an official sense, because the office is previously defined to be that of an evangelist.

That money collected for the relief of the brethren in Judea was sent to the elders, is no proof that the deacons did not disburse it. In like manner those who sold their goods brought the proceeds and laid them at the feet of the apostles (Acts 4. 35); yet the apostles called for the appointment of deacons to disburse these very funds—to every man as he had need. The daily ministrations, called service of tables, no doubt included all that pertained to this disbursement, and though the community of goods soon ceased, there was still the same general work of attending to the secular wants of the poor, which required the services of deacons, and so a continuance of the office.

That this office was so continued is abundantly evident from the undivided testimony of the Early Post-Apostolic Church.—Clement Romanus, who is honorably mentioned by Paul (Phil. iv. 3) says,—The Apostles "preaching through countries and cities, appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be bishops and deacons over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit." (I Cor. xix. 4). Polycarp, also an apostolic father, and said by his pupil Irenæus, to have been taught by the Apostles themselves, exhorts the Philippians to be "subject to the elders and deacons, as unto Christ." (Phil. ii. 13). In the various epistles of Ignatius, who was martyred about A. D. 117, we have very frequent mention of deacons, as officers of the church, and so on, down through the primitive writers.

I do not desire to make this case any stronger than it is, and would not be understood as holding the position that the Scriptures are very definite as to all the duties and privileges of the deacon. I think that very large freedom was given to all Christians to do for the infant and struggling kingdom, asopportunity offered, whatever their gifts enabled them to do; and that, whilst the primary and peculiar official duty of the deacon was to collect and disburse the alms of the church, their office almost necessa-

Digitized by Google

rily called out their gifts of prayer, of exhortation, of comfort, and of teaching;—that in circulating among the needy to see after the sick and dispense the charity of the church, they would necessarily be exposed to controversy and persecution, and thus acquire great boldness, and rise perhaps to eminence, such as might commend them to the higher rank of presbyter. This, under the freedom of the gospel, the legitimate inspiration of its genius, and the practical reaction of their pursuits, would be almost unavoidable; but we have no clear scriptural statements on the subject. So that, while the primitive writers raise no question as to the office, and several of them refer its origin specifically to Acts vi., there was, very early, a difference of opinion as to the limits of the deacon's powers as an officer—some restricting him entirely to secular affairs, and others claiming for him also spiritual functions.

I trust, my dear brother, that in this hasty review of your objections, I have not seemed to forget the very high respect and dear esteem in which, since our first acquaintance during your college days, I have always held you, and that something may have been added to the argument of my former article to induce us to see alike, in this important practical question, in the organization of the churches. I am always happy to hear from you, and beg that you will accept assurances of continued regard.

W. K. P.

REMINISCENCES.

Bro. Pendleton:—I have just received a letter from our worthy and venerable brother, Silas Shelburne, from which the following is an extract:

"My general health is as good as I could expect, as I shall be 80 years old the 4th day of June. Though I am afflicted with hoarseness and cough, I have continued to attend my regular appointments each 1st day of the week. I have been preaching Christ Jesus the Lord for 53 years, and expect to continue as long as I am able to do so. The three churches I preach for had added to them about forty members last year. * * * I should be very glad to see you and Bro. Pendleton, and all our good brethren; yet I do not expect it in this life. Oh, may we meet in Heaven!—Yours in Christ, Silas Shelburne."

Digitized by Google

A brief notice of this old and faithful laborer is given in the 2nd Vol. of "Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," pp. 289-90. As there are various incidents connected with Bro. Shelburne and his father which could not find place in the above work, but would be appropriate in a complete history of the Reformation, I have thought some of them might not be uninteresting to the readers of the Harbinger, as serving to illustrate the former condition of religious society in Southern Virginia, as well as the necessity of our plea for reformation.

The following graphic account of James Shelburne, the father of Silas Shelburne, was given by the eminent Dr. Archibald Alexander, who was appointed, in 1812, the first professor in the Presbyterian Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J. Many years before this (in 1792), while engaged in a missionary tour in the southern part of Virginia, he happened to meet with James Shelburne at the house of a Mr. Yarborough, where he had called with his fellow-traveler, a Mr. Grigsby, to spend the night.

"Mr. Yarborough," said he, "took occasion to inform us that a Baptist preacher in his employment as a mill-wright, would be at his house as soon as his work was finished. Accordingly, about the dusk of the evening an old man in coarse garb, with leathern apron, entered the house and took his seat on the stairs. Neither Mr. Grigsby nor I had ever been acquainted with uneducated preachers, and we were struck with astonishment that this carpenter should pretend to preach. When we retired, Mr. Shelburne, such was his name, was put into the same room with us. I felt an avidity to question him respecting his call to the ministry, taking it for granted that the old man was ignorant. I therefore began by asking him what he considered a call to the ministry. Mr. Shelburne perceived the drift of my question, and instead of giving a general answer, proceeded to the narrative of his own experience, and to state the circumstances which had led him to suppose that God had called him to be a preacher, The substance of his story was as follows:

"I was born in one of the lower counties of Virginia, and when young, was put to learn the carpenter's trade. Until I was a man grown, and had a family, I never heard any preaching except from ministers of the Established Church, and did not even know that there were any others. About this time there came into the neighborhood a Presbyterian minister by the name of Martin, whom I went to hear, and before he was done I was convinced that I was in a lost and undone condition. He made no stay, and I heard no more of him. But a wound had been left in my conscience which I knew not how to get healed, and no one

Digitized by Google

about me could give any valuable advice as to a cure. I went from day to day under a heavy burden, bewailing my miserable state, till at length my distress became so great that I could neither eat nor sleep with any peace or comfort. My neighbors said that I was falling into melancholy or going mad, but not one of them had any knowledge, from experience, of the nature of my distress. Thus I continued mourning over my miserable case for weeks and months. I was led, however, to read constantly in the Bible; but this rather increased than lessened my distress; until one Sunday morning, I saw as clearly as ever I saw anything, how I could be saved through the death of Christ. I was filled with comfort, and yet sorrow for my sins flowed more copiously than ever. I praised God aloud, and immediately told my wife that I had found salvation; and when any of my neighbors came to see me, I told them of the goodness of God, and what he had done for my soul, and how he had pardoned my sins. As I spoke freely of the wonderful change I had experienced, it was soon noised abroad, and many came to see me and to hear an account of the matter from my own mouth.

"On Sabbath evenings my house would be crowded, and when I had finished my narrative, I was accustomed to give them a word of exhortation, and as I could be better heard when standing, I stood and addressed my neighbors, without any thought of preaching. After proceeding some time in this way, I found that several others began to be awakened by what they heard from me, and appeared to be brought through the new birth much as I had been. This greatly encouraged me to proceed in my work, and God was pleased to bless my humble labors to the conversion of many. All this time I did no more than to relate my own experience, and then exhort my neighbors to seek unto the Lord for mercy. Thus was I led on from step to step, until at length I actually became a preacher without intending it. Exercised persons would frequently come to me for counsel, as I had been the first among them to experience the grace of God; and that I might be able to answer their questions, I was induced to study the Bible continually; and often while at work, particular passages would be opened to my mind; which encouraged me to hope that the Lord had called me to instruct those who were more ignorant than myself; and when the people would collect at my house, I explained to them the passages which had been opened to my mind. All this time I had no instruction in spiritual matters from any man, except the sermons I had heard from Mr. Martin. But after a few years, there came a Baptist preacher into our neighborhood, and I found that his doctrine agreed substantially with my experience, and with what I had learned out of the Bible. I traveled about with him, and was encouraged by him to go on in the exercise of my gift of public speaking, but was told by him that there was one duty which I was required to perform, which was that I should be baptized according to the command of Christ; and as we rode along we

Digitized by Google

came to a certain water, and I said, See here is water, what doth hinder me to be baptized? Upon which we both went down into the water, and he baptized me by immersion, in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. From that time I have continued till this day, testifying to great and small, to white and black, repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ; and not without the pleasure of seeing many sinners forsaking their sins and turning toward God.

"Now, said he, you have heard the reasons which induce me to believe that God has called me to preach the gospel to the poor and ignorant I never considered myself competent to instruct men of education and learning. I have always felt badly when such have come to hear me But as for people of my own class, I believe that I could teach them many things which they need to know; and in regard to such as had become pious, I was able, by study of the Bible and meditation, to go before them, so to them also I could be in some measure a guide. I lament my want of learning, and am deeply convinced that it is useful to the ministry of the gospel; but it seems to me that there are different gifts, as of old, and one man may be suited to one part of the Lord's work, and another to another part. And I do not know but that poor and ignorant people can understand my coarse and familiar language better than the discourses of the most learned and eloquent men. I know their methods of thinking and reasoning, and how to make things plain by illustrations and comparisons adapted to their peculiarities and habits.'

"When the old mill-wright had finished his narrative, I felt much more inclined to doubt my own call to the ministry than that of James Shelburne. Much of the night was spent in shch conversation, while my companion was enjoying his usual repose. We talked freely about the doctrines of religion, and were mutually gratified to find how exactly our views tallied. From this night, James Shelburne became an object of my high regard, and he gave abundant testimony of his esteem for me. Whenever I visited that part of the country, he was wont to ride many miles to hear me preach, and was pleased to declare that he had never heard any of his own denomination, with whose opinions he could so fully agree as with mine. I had the opportunitv of hearing him preach several times, and was pleased, not only with the soundness of his doctrine, but the unaffected simplicity of his manner. His discourses consisted in a series of judicious remarks expressed in the plainest language, and in a conversational tone, until he became by degrees warmed with his subject, when he fell into a singing tone, but nothing like what was common with almost all Baptist preachers of the country at that time. As he followed his trade from day to day, I once asked him how he found time to study his sermons; to which he replied, that he could study better at his work, with his hammer in his hand, than if shut up and surrounded with books. When he had passed the seventieth year

Digitized by Google

of his age, he gave up work and devoted himself entirely to preaching. Being a man of firm health, he traveled to a considerable distance, and preached nearly every day. On one of these tours, after I was settled in Charlotte county, I saw him for the last time. The old man appeared to be full of zeal and love, and brought the spirit of the gospel into every family which he visited. He was evidently ripening for heaven, and accordingly, not long after, he finished his course with joy."

In this account by Dr. Alexander there are some things which do not entirely accord with facts related to me respecting James Shelburne by his son Silas. He says that his father was not a mill-wright as Dr. Alexander supposed, probably from the fact that he was engaged in repairing the *mill-house* of Mr. Yarborough. He was simply a house carpenter. Dr. Alexander was under the impression also that he received his first religious impressions from Presbyterian preacher and that he did not for a long time afterwards know any thing of the Baptists. The circumstances attending his baptism too are quite different. His son's statement is as follows:

"James Shelburne was a son of Augustin Shelburne, and born Oct., 1739. His parents being Episcopalians, he was brought up in their belief, but removing to Lunenburg co. when about 25 years old, he there heard discourses by some Presbyterian and two Baptist preachers, which led him to reflect upon his spiritual state, to feel the necessity of a change of heart, and to study the Scriptures. This resulted in deep convictions upon his part, and in a sincere and earnest faith, leading him to serve God from love to him and to his cause and people, and producing so marked a change that several of his acquaintances became also impressed by religion, among whom may be mentioned John Williams, Henry Lester, Henry Haley, and Elijah and Leonard Baker, who subsequently became useful laborers in the Baptist cause. Alex. Walker, a Baptist preacher of considerable talent, was preaching in Nottoway co., some 25 miles distant, and going to hear him, they confessed their faith Mr. Walker then held a meeting in Lunenburg, when James Shelburne and 16 others were baptized, forming the Meherrin church. Being an earnest Christian, James Shelburne felt constrained to make efforts for the salvation of those around him, and began to hold meetings for prayer, reading and exhortation, which were so greatly blessed to the conversion of sinners, that he feared to discontinue his efforts, humbly as he esteemed them. He was at this time engaged in the business of a house-carpenter, and had six or eight hands employed on a building for a W. J. Patterson. As there was no preaching within 10 miles, he felt strongly moved, while at his work, to devise some way of getting prayer and exhortation introduced into the family of his em-

Digitized by Google

ployer, but finding no opportunity, he became so much distressed that in the midst of the night he offered up fervent prayer for the accomplishment of his object. While thus engaged, he heard Mr. Patterson call and direct that all the family, white and black, should be summoned to his bedside, as he thought he had but a few moments to live. Calling for Mr. Shelburne to come and pray for him, he said to him when he entered the room: 'I thought I should die, but the moment your foot touched the floor, I was relieved, and became as free from pain as ever in my life.' Mr. Shelburne then confessed to him the anxiety he had had to have prayer and exhortation in the family, and asked Mr. Patterson if he would allow him to have the family together and to read and pray with them while he stayed. Mr. P. said it should be so from that moment. He also furnished him a house to speak in, and during his stay, professed faith in Christ, as did also his brother, mother and sister, becoming the first members of the Reedy Creek church. In 1770, James Shelburne was ordained by Jeremiah Walker and Samuel Harris, and from that time forward to 1820, for about 51 years, continued a laborious and successful ministry, which endeared his name and his memory to thousands. During all this time, also, until within a few years of his death, he ceased not to follow his occupation as house-carpenter."

From Dr. Alexander's account, it would seem as if James Shelburne fully coincided in the views then prevailing in religious society respecting conversion, viz., that it consisted in a sudden and overwhelming "operation" upon the individual; as if justification was a *physical* rather than a *judicial* act, and religion an immediate and miraculous illumination of the mind rather than a regular and divinely appointed system of renovation of life and character. There is no doubt, I presume, that he sympathized with this popular sentiment in the early part of his religious career. His mind however was of too robust and practical a character, as may be seen in his views of his ministerial call, to remain under the influence of any religious theory. While this lingered indeed, during the first twenty years of his religious life, he suffered much, as I am informed, from doubts and fears as to his acceptance with God. His son Silas adds, 'that at length, by carefully examining the evidences of pardon and salvation found in the word of God, he became satisfied that faith, love and obedience were the proper grounds of confidence and that he had erred in endeavoring to obtain this from his feelings, and by comparing his feelings with those of others, rather than by trusting to the Word of God. From this time, realizing that he sincerely believed in Christ and was willing to show his faith and love by

Digitized by Google

doing whatsoever he was commanded, he became entirely free from all distressing doubts and able to overcome readily the trials and discouragements incident to the present life.'

It is worthy of mention also that this remarkable man was from the first utterly opposed to the use made of church covenants and creeds. At the time of his ordination, a creed or articles of faith were proposed, but he opposed them and would not submit, and continued through life to teach that the word of the Lord was sufficient for faith and practice. Hence the Meherrin church of which he was at first a member and the Reedy creek church of which he was afterward Pastor until his death, never adopted *authoritative* creeds or articles of faith, but took the word of God as it stands. Neither he nor these churches objected to a mere *declarative* statement of views for the benefit of others, but they would not consent to regard this as a limitation to Christian knowledge or as binding on the conscience. This may be seen by the following extract from the Meherrin Church Book, which occurs after some short articles of belief:

"We therefore do hereby testify, That this is a brief summary of our faith and principles (with some few exceptions not essential to salvation or church communion). We therefore adopt it as a good human composition in the general, which we agree to observe both in principle and church government, so long as we shall believe it agreeable to God's word, and no longer; as we believe the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be the only standard of truth by which the church is to conduct herself, (whatever respect she may have to good human composition.) For we believe the church of Christ will have more and more discoveries of light into the glorious treasury of God's word, while she continues in her militant state, and so consequently it would be presumption before God, and forming chains to fetter our consciences with, to bind ourselves with any set of unalterable, unchangeable principles whatever, except what is written in the glorious, unchangeable word of God, which liveth and abideth forever."

All this was in exact accord with Mr. Campbell's views, as declared in a letter to Spencer Clack:

"I have often said," he remarks, "and let me tell you that I am not like your friend Aleph, always turning about on this question, or any other which I publicly avow, for I have declared in the first letter I ever presented to a Baptist Association, many years ago, that I cared not how many creeds were published,—I would not object to publishing a creed every year,—provided it was only to inform the world what I or those

Digitized by Google

in union with me held, and not to be made a test of Christian character, nor a term of Christian communion "

It may easily be seen how well, with such an example before him of Christian independence and reverence for the teachings of the Bible, the mind of Silas Shelburne was prepared to receive the simple views of the gospel presented in the Christian Baptist, and to engage in the effort to acccomplish a much needed reformation from the errors and usages imposed by tradition, and the theories so zealously advocated by metaphysical divines. Christianity needs not the aid of metaphysics or of superstition. Its adaptation to the human heart is felt by the unlettered, who are quite unable to assign a reason for their convictions, and who hence are fond of certain preachers who are able to present the saving truths of the gospel to their minds clearly, forcibly and feelingly. Hence too, they are indifferent to others who have much to say *about* Christianity but furnish no food for the soul. Under the labors of Silas Shelburne, more correct views of the gospel began to prevail in the Meherrin Association, and excited a violent opposition on the part of those who were wedded to their theological systems. Among the latter, the views taught by Mr. Campbell were, however, so misrepresented and misunderstood, that they were quite at a loss as to the charges to be brought against the reformers. They would ask them if they made baptism change the heart? The latter made answer that the heart was changed by the Holy Spirit through the belief of the truth, and that this change must always precede baptism.— The questioners were puzzled with this reply, which, though precisely Mr. Campbell's view of the matter, was so different from what was reported as 'Campbellism' that they were unable to find any just cause of censure. Through the prudence and influence of Silas Shelburne and his coadjutors, schism in the Meherrin Association was prevented, and the reformation was about to prevail in most if not all of the churches, when the bold and speculative materialist, Dr. Thomas, unfortunately visited that part of Virginia, and by his false doctrines, (which the Baptists were glad to impute to the Reformers,) gave to the opponents of the reformation the opportunity to effect a separation. Brother Shelburne, amidst many difficulties nobly opposed Dr. Thomas' speculations and succeeded in inducing some of the churches to repudiate them. In this, he was much aided by Mr. Campbell's dis-

Digitized by Google

cussion with Dr. Thomas at Painesville, and by the faithful subsequent labors of Elders R. L. Coleman and Chester Bullard. Order being at length restored, and the Meherrin Association dissolved, a simple co-operation of churches was formed, in which Bro. Shelburne continued to labor until his removal to Hanover, in 1849.

This worthy Son of a noble Sire has endured much hardship and persecution for the truth's sake, and has bestowed upon the churches a vast amount of ministerial labor for more than half a century. He has now been, as he says, 'preaching Christ Jesus the Lord for fifty-three years, and expects to continue to do so to the end.' "I have never regretted" says he "the efforts I made to reform my Baptist brethren, though from 1827 till 1840 I was entirely occupied in riding and preaching without fee or reward." The support of this worthy brother has indeed been always scanty, owing to the difficulties with which the cause has had to contend,—the state of the churches, the desolations of civil war, &c. May the Lord sustain and bless our venerable brother, who has so long and so faithfully pleaded for the primitive faith and institutions of the gospel! He at present preaches for several churches in Hanover Co., his address being Montpelier.

His son Cephas, baptized in 1833 and ordained in 1840, became quite a useful and successful preacher in South West Va., and was widely and deservedly esteemed. He died in 1865 at his residence in Montgomery Co. leaving a widow and seven children. Two other sons of Silas Shelburne, James and Samuel, in Lee Co., Va., are now actively engaged in preaching, and are exerting a good influence in the cause of truth. R. R.

BETHPHAGE, March 2nd, 1870.

The University at Canton, Mo., is reported in a highly prosperous condition.

Deliberate with caution, but act with decision; and yield with graciousness or oppose with firmness.

It is said that in some of the churches in Boston, *sponge-cake* is used in the communion service instead of bread!

A generous soul never loses the remembrance of the benefits it has received, but easily forgets those its hand dispenses.

Digitized by Google

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.—EXTRAORDINARY DUPLICITY.

The *New York Evening Post* of March 1, 1870, under the heading, *Church and State*, has a short communication, of which we quote here the beginning:

"*To the Editors of the Evening Post:*

"When the Common Council of New York refused, in 1841, to grant the prayer of the petitioners for the apportionment of school moneys to the Roman Catholic schools, there were several private meetings of Roman Catholics held in the city, which Bishop Hughes addressed to this effect:

"'Your first and most sacred obligation and duty is to advance the interests of your church; your duty to the state is secondary. As citizens of the country you possess the right of suffrage, and by your numbers holding the balance of power between the contending political parties, you are bound by your most sacred relations to exert the power and influence which that position gives to you, as will best and most effectually advance the interests of the church. That you can do by giving your votes to whatever political party will do the most for you.'

I do not pretend to give the language, but I give the substance of an injunction contained in his several harangues, which were repeatedly delivered to his parishoners. The last time at which I remember its utterance was in a building then called St. John's Hall, at which time he nominated a general ticket for the Senate and Assembly of the state legislature, made up of selections from the whig and democratic regular party nominations, and by the result of the election which followed demonstrated the power he had invoked."

This was in 1841. Some thirteen years afterwards, in June of 1854, (it may have been in '55, but I think it was the former) I was in the city of Pittsburgh; and learning that Archbishop Hughes was to deliver a lecture before an association of Catholic young men, I determined to hear him. It was during the most exciting period of the general anti-Catholic movement in our country,—and no where was the excitement more intense than in Pittsburgh. It was understood that the arch-bishop,—this Goliah of American Romanism, would grapple with the 'burning question' of this anti-Catholic crusade in his lecture. The comparatively meagre audience that assembled in St Paul's Cathe-

Digitized by Google

dral to hear His Eminence, showed that Pittsburgh and its suburbs, in spite of their immense Catholic population, cannot support a very numerous Association of Catholic Young Men for literary purposes. The archbishop appeared in the pulpit, a fine physical specimen of an Irishman, and strong, fearless and self-possessed,—complete master of himself. He spoke with remarkable deliberation and power; and altogether, in the bold physical outlines of features, in bearing, in manner of address, the only person I could compare him to, of all speakers I had ever heard, was Alexander Campbell. There was a striking resemblance. On his breast he wore the golden cross, the symbol of his episcopal dignity. It was evident, from the looks of the audience, that a good portion was Protestant,—and this did evidently not escape the notice of the arch-bishop;—he was doubtless also aware that reporters were present. That he was conscious of all this was revealed in the lecture.

As a foundation for his address he read the text,—"Render, therefore, unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." This text involved the question on which we were especially anxious to hear the spiritual leaders of the Catholics.

The archbishop opened his discourse by stating, that the Bible recognized two *orders*, the spiritual and the civil; that these two were quite distinct from each other, yet not opposed. The dignity and purity of the church, and the welfare of society, and the true interests of all good government, demanded that the distinction between these two *orders* should be clearly recognized, and that they should never be confounded. For the spiritual order in any manner to overstep its own limits and interfere with the civil order, or vice versa, was a flagrant violation of the law of God, and an encroachment on the freedom and consciences of men, and a source of corruption in both orders. As on the one hand the spiritual order, representing and administering, as the appointed and thereunto sanctified ministry of God, the Church, should resist and rebuke every attempt on the part of the civil order,—the secular power, to interfere in any way in the affairs of the church,—so likewise, the civil order should resist and rebuke any attempt on the part of the spiritual order to interfere in the things that God has placed under its rule. "The things that are God's," belong to the spiritual,—"the things that are Caesar's," to the civil power.

Digitized by Google

This distinction and separation, by the divine law, between the spiritual and the civil powers, or '*orders*' were set forth with clearness and force; it was all any enlightened man could have asked, or could have said. He then assured us that the Catholic Church had always maintained, in doctrine and practice, everywhere, most scrupulously this distinction and separation,—*as the Protestants had not.* He pretended that the very soul and spirit, the very organization of the Catholic church, necessarily tended to keep these two 'orders' separate, and that her great conflicts and sufferings were the fruits of her resisting the interference of these two powers with each other's prerogatives. He maintained that all the Catholics asked, was to be left free in the peaceful exercise of their religion; and what they asked in this respect for themselves, they accorded most willingly to others.

The archbishop then proceeded to discuss, as a most vital element in this whole question, the topic of *personal freedom* in the exercise of civil and political privileges. He applied the distinction between the 'two orders' to the individual man. The spiritual authority, he declared, could lawfully claim and exercise its influence over a man, and demand obedience of him, only in spiritual matters; there its control ended; the spiritual authority of the church, in any of its forms, transcended its lawful limits when it attempted to influence any man in civil or political matters. The Catholic, he assured us, was in the exercise of his civil and political rights and privileges, *a free man*,—perfectly free, as a citizen, from all control or influence of the spiritual order in his church. No power in the Catholic Church,—he most solemnly and emphatically declared,—from the highest to the lowest, 'from the Pope to the humblest priest,' had any right whatever to interfere with any Catholic in matters belonging to the civil order; to do so would be to violate the law and spirit,—the doctrine and practice, of the Catholic church. The climax that here followed,—it was so strong, bold and extraordinary as to be not easily forgotten,—I may venture to give as in his own words:—"Catholic young men," said he, "I say to you, if a priest, privately, in the pulpit, or the sanctuary of the confessional, attempts to invade or interfere with your personal freedom, as a citizen, in civil or political affairs, rebuke him!—if your venerable bishop should transcend the sacred duties of his spiritual office, and use it to seek to influence you in civil matters, re-

Digitized by Google

buke him!—if the Holy Father, the Pope himself, should transgress the limits of the *spiritual* power that God has given him, and seek to control you politically, rebuke him!"

The reader may rely upon the correctness of these statements, extraordinary as they are. It made a profound impression on me at the time, and I carefully noted the main parts, and the general current of the lecture. Again and again the archbishop declared with peculiar emphasis, and in strong words, that the charge by Protestants, that the Catholic clergy used their influence as clergy, as the 'spiritual order,' in civil and political matters, in any way, with Catholics, was,—we quote his precise word often repeated,—"a calumny." With many Protestants he said, this odious idea of the Catholic clergy was but the chimera of a disordered imagination, the fruit of false teachings, "ignorance, or prejudice." "Here," said he, touching repeatedly his forehead, with a bitter contemptuous smile, "*here* is where the trouble with these people lies. They need *light, intelligence!*—the darkness that dwells here is the mother of these unfounded, odious prejudices and calumnies;—a little more light would dissipate all these."

While I could not but feel surprise at hearing a leading prelate of the Catholic church, and that of the least liberal class, an Irish-American, in a Catholic Cathedral, thus advocate, in most unequivocal terms, the true American anti-Catholic doctrine of clerical and ecclesiastical non-interference in civil affairs, I was still more amazed at the deliberate attempt made before intelligent Protestants, and even Catholics, to vindicate the Catholic church from the charge of having transgressed, or being disposed to transgress, this principle of the separation of the 'spiritual and civil orders,' when there is not a country on earth where Romanism has not, when in the ascendant, attempted, by its spiritual power, to interfere in, and even control, civil affairs, often on the broadest scale, and in the extremest, most high-handed way;—when much of the history of the past centuries, is but the history of these attempts,—so often and so long, alas, successfully made.—That Rome is on the Tiber is not better known, nor as well, as this fact. One side only of this plea of the archbishop for the Catholic Church *is* true; and that is, that it has always claimed and fought for the *freedom of the church from any control on the part of the State.* This is a great doctrine in the Catholic Church, asserted again and again, age after age, though not always suc-

Digitized by Google

cessfully even in Catholic countries. It is a cardinal point before the Roman Church to-day, for which Pius ix has declared he will battle to the end, and which he has proclaimed in his *Syllabus* and other 'apostolical' missives. But the other side, the non-interference of the spiritual order,—or of the church,—in civil matters, the Pope and the church by him represented, most emphatically deny. But of this more at another time.

The special object of this article, however, was, to contrast Archbishop Hughes in Pittsburgh, in 1854 with bishop Hughes in New York in 1841. The doctrine that 'the end sanctifies the means,' and that falsehood and treachery are venial and even laudable, when done for the glory of the church, may have quieted the conscience of this Catholic prelate in all this; but such amazing duplicity on the part of her most eminent and most honored representatives, will teach men what confidence is to be put in the pretensions and good faith of the Catholic Church; and by the Catholic church we mean chiefly her 'spiritual order,' of whatever class, or rank. That there are men in the Catholic church, both clergy and laity, of honor and unswerving candor and conscience, we know, and rejoice to know; but such conduct as here illustrated on the part of Archbishop Hughes, will surely not tend to strengthen the confidence of the American people in the Catholic clergy among us. This scandalous double-facedness brings to memory a passage from Count Montalembert, one of the most eminent Catholic statesmen of France; a passage drawn from him on a great public occasion by the very notorious, treacherous double-dealing of Catholics towards non-Catholics. "Let us (Catholics) not have the appearance," said he, "of wishing to introduce ourselves into modern society, by hoisting its colors, by appealing to its principles, by claiming its guaranties, while we are the most feeble party, in order that we may some day turn against the rights of our adversaries, under the pretext that *error has no rights*. After having said at one time: 'The Church asks nothing more than simply freedom, the freedom of all;' let us not, at another time, when the power is on our side, say: 'The Church alone has a right to be free!'" * High minded and honorable men in the Catholic

* *L'Eglise libre dans l'Etat libre* ['The Free Church in the Free State;' —Two addresses delivered before the Catholic Congress at Malines, in Belgium, in 1863] p. 136.

Digitized by Google

Church itself, have felt what it has done by its conduct through the ages to lose the confidence of the world.

But,—let no man be deceived,—"God is not mocked," nor will truth in the end be conquered and outraged. All falsehood, all treachery, all deceit, though it may gain, as a base policy, an immediate end, will always in the final issues be exposed and put to shame and confusion; and the Catholic power to-day is expiating among the nations, once her vassals, the very sins she has committed in this regard, in the past ages, against truth and against the most sacred liberties of humanity. C. L. L.

CHRIST AT THE WELL OF SAMARIA.

I shall only notice some of the incidents in the interview of Jesus with the woman of Samaria. They will afford us a lesson of instruction of great value, that perhaps may be needed in our day, as indeed at all times, among those who are called to be teachers of the Word or preachers of the glad tidings.

The first thing that strikes the mind of the reader, is the gentleness of Christ. As he approaches the Samaritan woman, you see none of the prejudices of the Jew. He saw in her only a woman, a descendant of one common father; a fallen, sinful creature, needing light and salvation. He did not feel towards her as the body of the Jewish people did, with whom they would have no dealings;—"Thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil." Every thing a Samaritan touched, in their judgment, was unclean. He was publicly cursed in their synagogues; "could not be adduced in the Jewish courts as a witness—could not be admitted to any sort of proselytism."

The first words of Jesus to this woman of Samaria were, "Give me to drink." He thus acknowledged his dependence on her,—gave her the privilege of doing him a favor,—placed himself in relation of a debtor to her; and put her at ease with herself.—Few things will disarm even an enemy so soon as the asking of a common favor,—"Give me to drink." To the degraded, nothing is so effectual in securing attention as the exercise of some of the ordinary courtesies of life. They feel their situation at times most keenly. They have lost all self-respect, and any one who sees anything in them as worthy of the common recognition of

Digitized by Google

the privileges of humanity, will not fail to touch some latent chord in their hearts. Jesus treated this Samaritan—this degraded Samaritan—with respect, and how instantly it was responded to!

Jesus spoke to her of her sin, but in such a manner as to win her confidence, and disarm her of all prejudice or resentment.—"Go call thy husband." Jesus knew that she had no lawful husband, and was anxious to make her feel in his presence self-condemned. He acknowledged that she spoke the truth when she said, "I have no husband;" but in so doing he arraigned before her the hidden secrets of her life; and in how few words! "Thou saidst well: I have no husband. For thou hast had five husbands; and he whom thou *now* hast is not thy husband."

He did not taunt nor condemn her, as others would have done. He did not say, "O, this is due to your religion," as a true sectarian would have done exultingly. He did not exaggerate her state and become eloquent over the enormity of her wickedness. He understood her case well, and realized fully the folly and guilt involved in it. But where others had reproaches he had tears. Where others gathered stones to hurl at the head of the notoriously wicked, Jesus had forgivenesses. He gave her full credit for all the truth she had spoken, and forced upon her the persuasion that "he was a prophet."

How much was gained by this? A prophet was in Samaria, and stood face to face with this notorious woman! She had never encountered such a person before. She felt that here is one who knows me. "He has told me all that I ever did." Jesus could now speak with authority and send the arrows of conviction through the hard incrustations of sin that had gathered round her heart. She was conscious of her own nakedness in the presence of him who was the revealer to man of his guilt and the ineradicable maladies that reign within. She endeavored to divert him from his purpose;—to send him off on another tack by throwing a challenge at his feet: "Our fathers worshiped in this mountain; and *ye* say that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship." This was the old question of dispute between the Jew and Samaritan. Doubtless she was skilled in this article of her religion,—that Mount Gerizim was the true mountain and her temple the true temple. The Jew was ever ready to discuss also a question so vital between the two rival nationalities. They

Digitized by Google

were fired with an unconquerable zeal whenever it was touched upon. Jesus was not thrown off his guard. He merely corrects her mistakes, and warns her of the fate of both mountains and the imminent danger of the peoples worshiping at them; and told her of the fact that "salvation was of the Jews." And that the worshipers, in spirit, could render God acceptable service any where. *He avoided all controversy with her.* What a fine opportunity was there here for a sharp and exhaustive debate. What zeal might have been manifested for the truth. What important national questions might have been logically settled between the Jews and Samaritans. The disciples would soon return from the city. They would not only have the benefit of the debate, but the whole city would soon hear of it, and come to the discussions at the "well of Jacob." The Doctors of the law in Jerusalem and the rulers of all the synagogues would soon hear of the extraordinary defeat of the Samaritans; and the Nazarene would mightily grow in their favor. Any Pharisee or Sadducee in Jerusalem, if at all posted up in the arguments *pro* and *con*, would have seized upon the occasion to defend the truth. But Jesus struck at the conscience, and this is never hit in controversy.—The parable of Nathan and "*Thou* art the man," will accomplish far more than all the polemical skill that the most combative disputant can summon to his work. That self-knowledge which teaches us humility teaches us compassion for the weaknesses of others. It checks injustice and impatience; and gives us tolerance under the contradictions of the wayward and the ignorant. It is the only antidote to that self-love that bristles under the opposition made to our opinions; and is nearly allied to that "meekness of wisdom" which is the ornament and safeguard of the faithful disciple of Jesus.

He who advocates the cause of Christ should remember that the truth he upholds will not atone for his impertinence, nor the doctrine he teaches justify his uncharitableness, nor the zeal he exhibits make up for his bitterness The greater the cause for controversy, the greater the necessity for moderation and candor. A judicious silence, often, is of more weight than a warm temper and an intolerant zeal. Our moderation may open the eyes of those who may not be convinced by our arguments; and the temper with which we advocate the truth may be the surest passport to the hearts of our opponents.

Digitized by Google

It will be impossible to avoid conflict with the enemies of the truth. Indeed, we are "to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints." But the temptation to indulge in vituperation; in bitterness and clamor, and evil speaking, is so great, that no one needs to covet it. A litigious nature is not an amiable one; and if indulged in will grow to all uncharitableness.—These Goliaths, after all, are only physically strong. They may wear a helmet of brass on their heads, and be armed with a coat of mail, and the staff of their spear be like a weaver's beam.—They may be full of wrath and defiance, but the smooth stone of the brook and the sling of the shepherd will be more than a match for their boasted prowess. The first king of Israel, Saul the son of Kish, was the ideal type of the head and champion of a people sunk in the basest idolatry. He was a young and inexperienced man, sent by his father to look after the asses just escaped from his pasture. In fact, *this* was what by nature and education he was fitted to do. But he was a head and shoulder taller than any man of all the tribes; and this, in their estimation, was his chief recommendation. God let them have their own way;—for, said he, "they have rejected me." He told them what 'manner' of a king he should be. He was a bold, boastful, intemperate and rash fighter,—the very personification of animalism. In the greatest battle that he fought, and after the most signal victory he won, the shepherd boy slew his ten thousands, while Saul only slew his thousands.

If our numerous discussions with the pen and the tongue have done much to disabuse the public mind of error and prejudice, how much more would the interests of truth have been maintained, if, with a zeal according to knowledge, we had sent the gospel where it is not, and had cultivated the spirit of unity and love; of self-denial and heroic sacrifice in the cause of the Redeemer. I cannot but think that if we had sent missionaries to Europe and Asia; to Africa and the islands of the seas; and if *now* we would send out an organized band of disciples to the Freedmen of the South, as teachers of schools and preachers of the word; if we had been untiring in our devotion to Christ and his cause,—our numbers and our efficiency would be increased a hundred fold. Shall we ever get beyond the primer in the school of Christ, or must we always fight the Sanballats and Tobiases, and never build up the walls of the Great City? I don't know

Digitized by Google

whether we shall ever destroy all the error that is in this most disjointed world. Certainly the serpents that Hercules was sent to crush were not the creatures that an infant's hand could strangle. It is a most discouraging fact that of old, they grew as fast as their heads were decapitated. Killing monsters of strange device may be the calling of some, but saving men through the power of the gospel, should be the work of all. JAS. CHALLEN.

'MUSICAL CULTURE' BY 'E.'

[The following reply to an article in the January number of the Harbinger, by 'E.,' is from the pen of brother 'H.,' of the *Apostolic Times*. The propriety of using musical instruments in our church worship, is a question of daily increasing practical importance. Many of our congregations already use instruments; and many more, which do not admit them into the worship of the church, encourage or allow them in the Sunday Schools. Many families use the melodeon or piano in accompaniment to the voice in private worship, and thus there is a gradual familiarity with the employment of instruments in sacred music growing up among us, that can scarcely fail to educate the disciples to the employment of them in the public worship of the congregation. I presume to say that there is equal piety and sincerity on both sides of this investigation, and hope that it will be conducted with the only weapons that can permanently influence minds so trained to independent investigation as are our brethren. The *investigation* ought not to become a *controversy*. Let us look calmly and courteously for the truth, for there are good men and argumentative minds on both sides. The question is not to be settled by dogmatism nor denunciation. Ridicule nor sarcasm can neither deter the advocates of this new custom from introducing it, nor silence its opponents in their sincere and deliberate sentiments of resistance. Let us sift it to the bottom, as we have done many another knotty question, and then kindly and fraternally harmonize upon the verdict of the general judgment. We have been free and frank to express our own judgment on the subject, but desire to have all views fairly and fully represented. It would be well if those who write on the question would clearly define the ground on which they propose to rest the argument, and then adhere logically to the discussion of the definite issue. Is there express and specific scripture teaching against instrumental music

Digitized by Google

in church worship? Or must we rest opposition upon the ground of expediency? Let the writers make their election, and then in discussion adhere to the one or the other issue, or to both, and we may hope to come to some conclusion that will be satisfactory.—W. K. P.]

"In the January Millennial Harbinger for the current year, is an article on the above subject, and signed "E.," from which I wish to make some extracts and on which I wish to offer a few comments. "E.," judging from the style of the piece, is a man of scholarly attainments. He writes beautifully and tastefully. But a very unsound doctrine may be written in very graceful language. A most fallacious and untruthful statement may be expressed in an utterance that is verbally, grammatically, and rhetorically, faultless. It is said that fine feathers make the bird.—However this may be, fine clothes do not make the man. Nor does logic, nor reason, nor argument consist in rhetorical flourishes and æsthetical sentences. A chaste diction is not quite synonymous with hard logic among a thinking people. "E.," opens his battery of the "true, beautiful and good" upon the readers of the Harbinger in the following grand boom:

"Music is a science, and therefore God is its author and ordained its laws. All melodies and harmonies dwelt in the mind of the Creator, before the morning stars sang together and the sons of God shouted for joy; therefore man did not *invent* music, and after six thousand years of trial he is now only making discoveries in the charming world of harmony."

This is true. It is beautifully said. Who doubts its truth or the beauty of it? But does it follow that because God ordained music and its laws, that he ordained musical instruments and all the uses to which they are put? Did he ordain the drum and fife to stir up the soldier's blood and excite him to the terrible deed of taking human life? Does he justify the taking of human life in war, because the soldier's emotional nature is stimulated to the deed under the influence of music? Has God ordained the music of the fiddle and the purposes to which the fiddle is devoted? The violin stirs up the emotional nature and inspirits one with an intense desire to participate in the intoxicating dance and the sensuous, yea, sensual waltz. And who that was a devotee of the dance could not speak in wild raptures of the joyus ball-

Digitized by Google

room scene and accompaniments—the queenly beauty of the women, the dazzling show of their diamond jewels, &c., their gracefully floating robes, the poetry of motion, the delirium of joy, the the dream of Paradise, the sweet, soft, delicious music discoursed from Paganini's favorite instrument, and all the spirit-stirring, emotion-exciting, and soul-enrapturing concomitants of the hour? Grand, glorious, beautiful, emotional, ecstatic is that violin music, and that voluptuous dance. So it is. But it is the sensuous ecstasy of a sensuous soul, of the earth earthy, of the flesh fleshy —a worldly bliss of which the heart is so full that there is no room in it for God or the thought of religion.

"Music is a science, and therefore God is its author and has ordained its laws." Most true. But has he ordained, as we have before asked, the various uses to which men put it? That is the question. Has he ordained the music of the "spirit-stirring drum and ear-piercing fife" in war, the "quickening music" of the fiddle in the dance, the deep-toned harmonies of the organ in the worship in his house? Why not all as well as one of these be ordained by him, if because he has ordained the music, therefore he has ordained the instruments and the use of them? Why not, if there be (as "E." in another part of his article contends) no specific law, but a general one covering the case of music, and that general law, a permission to use it "as man may make discoveries in the charming world of harmony," of the adaptedness of the music to arouse his emotions and promote his enjoyments both in society and the church. "E." forgets that worship is specifically ordained of God. He is the author of man, of music and of worship. He thoroughly knows man and his emotional nature. The reading of a novel, the performance at a theatre, and the song at a secular concert may cause "the heart to swell with tenderness," and move it even to tears. God made the heart, ordained the laws of emotion, and desires tenderness to spring up and abide in that heart. But has he ordained the novel, the profane song and the theatre to produce that tenderness? Will the tenderness thus produced be religious, and is it in accordance with his will that these instrumentalities, or kindred ones, be brought into use in his house, in his worship, in order to accomplish that result? He knows that music will excite emotions of praise and love to him. He knows that the music of an organ *will not* excite these emotions, but others purely sensuous—mere

Digitized by Google

counterfeits, spiritually, which our "more talented brethren" mistake for the genuine. He knows that with them, under the plea of musical culture, "religion would degenerate into music," and that all spirituality and love-producing power would be eviscerated from the Christian worship. Hence he has not ordained instrumental music, either wind or stringed, in the worship in his house and among the ordinances of a "pure and undefiled religion." God desires to awake in us "the emotions of love, and reverence, and tenderness that swell the heart;" he aims to do this, *in part*, by "the quickening influence of music," but *he wills* to accomplish it by the music of song—the harmony and melody of sacred vocal music. In proof, he has ordained "singing, making melody in your heart," in the house of God. Again "E." says:

"It is admitted I think by all, except those unfortunate persons who are absolutely songless, that the music arouses feelings in the heart not found there before, and that it gives to the brain more vivid impressions of the thoughts presented to it than could be possible without its mystic influence. It is assumed that this quickening of the brain and heart comes from the thoughts found in the words and in no part from the sound of the singing.—Again we ask, if this be true, why was the music added? One of two positions must be admitted, either that there is power in mere sound to arouse brain and heart into earnest, loving sympathy with God and his Christ, or that all music is an incubus in worship and ought to be abandoned."

I would remark that the statement of "E." in regard to what is admitted contradicts his declaration as to what is assumed.—His allusion to the "absolutely songless" does not bring relief in the case. If all admit that "the music arouses feelings in the heart," &c., that could not possibly be produced "without its mystic influence," then there can be none to assume that these feelings are aroused by "the thoughts found in the words and in no part by the sound of the singing." If not inconsistent with the proper use of words I would both assume and admit that this "it is assumed" of "E." is simply the coinage of his own exuberantly imaginative brain. He must be not only "absolutely songless," but absolutely brainless or wicked who, knowing that God had by positive enactment added music to the words in worship, would dare to express the blasphemous conviction that the

Digitized by Google

beneficial influence of this part of the worship is attributable solely "to the thoughts found in the words and in no part to the sound of the singing." I beg leave to suggest that fancy is not fact, and that it would be quite difficult for "E." to point out the men alluded to under his "it is assumed."

But the most startling and objectionable statement of this "more talented" brother is, that unless we admit that "mere sound"—sound in and of itself—"has power to arouse brain and heart into earnest, loving sympathy with God and his Christ," then we must admit "that all music is an incubus in worship and ought to be abandoned." I admit neither. I deny both. God has commanded us to sing—to sing in words, to sing in the spirit and in the understanding. I am profoundly amazed, therefore, at the ignorance of the man in *the supposed case*, who contends that the power of music "to arouse brain and heart," &c., is owing to thoughts found in the words," without the sound of the singing, and that of the man in *the real case* before us, who contends that the arousing to this "earnest, loving sympathy with God and his Christ," can be produced by mere sound, without the words.—May I not ask, Why then were the words added? Why sing at all? If mere sound will produce this emotional, spiritual result, then what does it matter as to what is piped, harped or organed? Why not the "sounding brass or tinkling cymbal?"

As I advance in years I am constantly learning something new. I am much indebted to "E." for valuable information. For the first time I have learned that the "power of music to arouse brain and heart into earnest, loving sympathy with God and his Christ," resides, according to one, in "the thoughts of the words alone, and *in no part* in the sound of the singing," and, according to another, in the mere sound of the music independent of the "thoughts found in the words." But this is not all. Unless we admit this theory of *mere sound*, we must regard "all music as an incubus in worship, and therefore abandon it." God has joined together words and singing in the worship that belongs to his house. "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder," is a declaration of the Savior concerning marriage that applies to music as well. Let us, then, in our worship, have not the words without the music, nor the music without the words, but both the sound and the words. And let the sound be that of the human voice and not that of harp or pipe, violin or organ. "E"

Digitized by Google

must excuse us less talented ones for not accepting his senseless theory of "mere sound," and the wicked conclusion to which its non-acceptance would lead us—the abandonment of all music in the house of God. Let us quote once more:

"Nor should we feel irritated at each other for having different tastes in music. Some have unfortunately no appreciation of music, either of melody or harmony. They were born without the faculty, and therefore we may expect to find them actively opposed to what they cannot understand. We should sincerely sympathize with such, and no doubt we would, did they not insist upon giving us just such a learned criticism upon music as a blind man would be apt to make on the solar spectrum. Some can understand only simple melody of the very plainest kind. We should not expect them to delight in those beautiful harmonies which so entrance the souls of the more talented. Now, it would be sadly inexpedient to force an organ and a choir upon a congregation largely made up of persons to whom nature had not been lavish of her musical gifts—and on the other hand it would be tyrannical and oppressive if such congregations should put a bar on their more talented brethren and insist that they must worship God in nasal tones, utterly oblivious of time or tune, and expect them to feel any emotions but those of disgust. 'Let us be kindly affectioned one to another,' and avoid using harsh epithets about that which we do not understand."

To "E," it seems, must belong the exclusive privilege of using harsh epithets and insulting insinuations. The question in discussion in the above quotation, is most unfairly put. If so stated in ignorance, then "E" himself is guilty of writing about "what he does not understand." If stated in a knowledge of the precise issue, then he has intentionally misrepresented his brethren.—This misrepresentation is the more reprehensible because the writer, among his many assumptions, assumes to be in the possession of a most amiable, Christ-like spirit, and from his lofty spiritual eminence to exhort his less endowed brethren "not to be irritated at each other," "not to use harsh epithets," and "to be kindly affectioned one to another." Such preaching is sound, in the sense of wholesome. It is first-rate preaching. But I should like to see, in this case, and in all others, the sound doctrine endorsed by a practice rigidly consistent therewith. It is painful to say in the case of "E," that this consistency does not exist. Indeed, I have no hesitation in saying, that of all the ar-

Digitized by Google

ticles that have been written, which I have read, on the subject of music in worship, this one of "E.," in the Harbinger, is in tone and spirit the most objectionable. It appears to have but two main, noticeable features. It is an effort at fine writing, in proof that "E." belongs to the class of the "more talented" in the department of musical culture. It is a sneer—supercilious and prolonged—at all who oppose his *ipse dixit*, as unable to understand, appreciate or enjoy "beautiful harmonies." I do not believe that there is a church or a man among us that either advocates or desires a church-music in which God is to be worshiped in "nasal tones, utterly oblivious of time or tune." I venture the assertion that "E" does not either. Then why did he say it? Did he not know that it would "irritate?" Is there nothing "harsh" in speaking of those who favor vocal music alone in the church as being "actively opposed to what they can not understand;" as being about as competent "to make learned criticisms on music as a blind man would be apt to make on the solar spectrum;" and as "insisting that all must worship God in nasal tones, utterly oblivious of time or tune?" Is the issue fairly put by "E?" He knows that it is not. Why then did he put it unfairly?

The truth is this. Here and there may be found one who is opposed to all harmony in church-music and who contends for melody alone. But time and tune belong to melody as well as to harmony. And this vocal melody is not sought for in "nasal tones" by its advocates. The assertion that it is, is a misrepresentation if not an insult.

The majority among us (the dissenters are so few that this may be said to be the almost unanimous view), advocate the very highest musical culture, and desire in the house of God the very best music we can have, consistently with his word. We agree that the best music is harmony and melody combined. What, then, is the bone of contention, the cause of strife, the apple of discord? It is this. There is a party sprung up among us, wise above what is written, that desires to use instrumental music in the worship in God's house. The question is not, shall our church-music be improved, nor, shall we have good music, both melody and harmony—music ever mindful of both time and tune? No, not that. No controversy here. The issue is this. Shall this *very best music* that we can have in worship be vocal alone,

Digitized by Google

or shall it be vocal and instrumental combined? The argument is: Shall it be vocal according to the specific law of the Lord, or shall instrumental *be added* according to an imaginary rule of expediency, founded upon a still more imaginary general law that may, perhaps, apply in the case. As all parties advocate vocal music, the controversy is narrowed down to this: Shall instrumental music be used in the house of God? A "more talented" brother has no excuse to offer for his misstatement of the case.—It was misstated, doubtless, for a purpose. It is to be hoped that in all future discussions of the question, the issue will be precisely made, the arguments directed to the point in debate, and that reason and logic be used instead of fancy and assumptions. Let men say pretty things if they please and if they can; but let these pretty things be also both sound and true. The article of "E" is pretty, very pretty; but "further, this deponent saith not." H.

PROTESTANT PARTICIPATION IN STATE AID.

Last month we showed what enormous sums the Catholic church had succeeded in drawing, for its own religious purposes, from the treasuries of the State and city of New York, and what its plea was in favor of such subvention. The publication in the newspapers of the facts concerning this whole matter of support to sectarian establishments from the secular treasuries, has greatly aroused Protestant feelings, and a powerful effort will be made to stop the iniquity. In this special battle with the Catholic church, the anti-Catholic party could meet the foe in unbroken strength, 'doubly-armed in its just quarrel,' in the triumphant assertion and defense of a great and righteous principle, if Protestants had kept their own hands free from the base 'gifts.'—But unfortunately it is not so. Protestants in New York are now obliged to retrace their own steps, having by the results of this base scheme of State support to sects, become outwitted by their general enemy, the Catholic church, as might have been expected, and coming away, after their own participation in the 'gifts,' 'sadder and wiser' men. The record, as it lies before us, of this participation on the part of Protestant churches, teaches a very sad lesson;—reveals how much more power *policy* has over men than *principle;* how very slow men are, in the best case, to

Digitized by Google

vindicate the latter in themselves and for themselves, at whatever cost and loss of immediate advantages. It might be supposed that in this land at this day, the idea of state or municipal support to strictly sectarian institutions, would be at once and universally repelled by all enlightened, liberal-minded men,—especially Protestants. This is, however, very far from being the case, as demonstrated by the facts in the case before us, and by cases elsewhere in our land, where State subvention has been solicited or accepted by institutions wholly or largely of a particular religious type. The result in the city of New York is a very damaging one to the Protestant cause; for while in amount they have received but 'the crumbs from the rich man's table,' while the Catholic church rioted at the rich banquet, they have yet, by accepting these crumbs, countenanced the bad principle. The Protestants who stretched out their hands to receive these beggar's portions of 'broken meats' that were left by the Catholic 'feast of fat things,' stand as follows: Of Episcopal churches, *thirty* participated in the donations, to the amount of $29,335,09; of the Dutch Reformed churches, five, to the amount of $14,404.40,—a single church receiving 6,000 dollars; of Presbyterian churches, eighteen, to the amount of 8,363 dollars; of Methodist churches, 12 churches,—3,073 dollars; of Baptist (even Baptist!) churches, nine,—2,760 dollars; of German Evangelical churches, five,—2,027 dollars. Finally, the Jews drew 14,404 dollars.

If the Protestants represented in these many churches could not see the wrong of giving, and consequently of receiving, aid from the State for denominational purposes, last year, but see it very clearly now, it is very extraordinary, for it is an old question, that has been again and again thoroughly discussed from all sides. If the Protestant intelligence in these seventy-nine churches, with clear understanding and in good conscience, received this secular 'subvention,' it looks as if, after all, it is not such a very clear matter that State-aid to sectarian institutions is wrong,—is contrary to our American principles as represented in our constitutions and laws, and in the general sentiment of our people, as well as opposed to the spirit of Christianity;—not quite so clear as the anti-Catholic press is now endeavoring to make it out. Some forbearance is, therefore, to be had with the Albany Legislature and the New York City Council, if these do not at once see this wrong and abolish these 'gifts.' If thirty

Digitized by Google

Episcopal churches, claiming to be of the highest intelligence of society; eighteen Presbyterian, twelve Methodist, and nine Baptist churches,—preachers, elders and all,—saw no sin in accepting such 'aid,' how can we expect that a legislature and city council, neither famous for superior light, wisdom, conscience and piety, will see it? But if these seventy-nine churches, clergy and all, took the money, contrary to their convictions of right,—the case, in the light of Christian morals, is worse yet. This long list of Protestant churches receiving the people's money for their own sectarian ends, is a sad record for our day!

It is very easy to say, of course, that, as the money was to be thus distributed, "we might as well get our share of it." Every evil thing can be in this false way justified and participated in.—The minister was preaching, on a Sunday, in a church looking out on the sea, on a dangerous part of the English coast, where ships were often wrecked. The flock for generations had been wreckers,—that is, had plundered the wrecks and the wrecked.—The preacher had felt it his duty to remonstrate with his people against this wickedness. On this Sunday, while preaching, he noticed all at once a significant movement in the audience for the door. Looking through the window behind him sea-ward, he saw a wrecked vessel drifting toward the shore. Immediately he called out, "Stop a moment, brethren; one word before you go." So saying, he quickly went down into the aisle, toward the door, and said—"What I was going to say is this: If you *will* plunder that ship, why, let us all have a fair chance." With this he managed to be among the foremost in the race to the wreck.

The practice of institutions, literary or otherwise, wholly or mainly under the control and for the benefit, avowedly, of a particular religious denomination, seeking for aid from the public treasuries, is most reprehensible,—is what the conscience, and a true sense of what is high-minded and honorable, ought never to allow a religious people to do. To come in with the fair pretense,—that everybody is willing to make, the Catholics excepted,—that they "are not at all *sectarian*,"—is so very disingenuous, that it is always a grief to hear it made for such purposes. Who *pretends* to be *sectarian?* After we hear of an institution founded and established for a religious denomination, to its praise and for its ends; when we hear its people, its preachers, its papers speak of it and glory in it as *their* institution, and so com-

Digitized by Google

mend it to 'our people,'—it does not sound well, when money is to be got from the State or from other foreign sources, to hear men attempt to cover up or deny the plea made to 'our own people.' What is, on a full knowledge of the character of the institution, voluntarily given may be freely accepted;—but to ask for and accept for 'our institutions' money taken in any way from other people without their consent,—not given by them to the public treasury for any such purpose, is wholly unjustifiable.—To plead that it is voluntarily given by a legislature or city council, is saying nothing, as every man knows; for who does not know the false influences by which the large venal, often the controlling, element of our legislative bodies can be induced to give away what is not their own? And finally, it is a sight that does not particularly elevate our views of human nature to see the 'leading men,' the 'strong men,' engaged in establishing and guiding to their high destiny the noble institutions of a Christian people, hanging, as beggars, around the wings of a legislature to implore 'aid,'—covered up under the decent name of 'appropriations,' and going through all the tortuous mole-path windings, often, to gain their ends. This passion and practice of getting grants of money from public treasuries, is 'a sin' that, like avarice, 'so easily besets' men;—is contagious and polluting as the eastern leprosy. How much nobler it is, for a religious people to build up, with 'pure hearts' and 'clean hands,' by the blessing of God, which comes only on what is pure, their institutions by their own free-will offerings, by their own generous sacrifices, and so stand before the world in carrying on their great and noble work, with a consciousness of being in heart and hands 'void of all offense toward' God and man! C. L. L.

FAMILIARITY WITH THE BIBLE.

The N. T. writers and speakers were very familiar with the Old Testament Scriptures. How apt their citations! They were not *literalists*, for sometimes the *exact words* are not quoted; but they were *accurate—substantially correct* quoters.

How beautifully and forcibly does our Lord confirm and illustrate His teachings, in numerous instances, by quoting from the Old Testament Scriptures! In Gen. xv, 6, it is written: "And he [Abram] believed in the Lord; and He counted it to him for

Digitized by Google

righteousness." How forcibly is the great doctrine of justification by faith, inculcated and illustrated in Rom. iv., by quotation of the above passage in Genesis. Multiform citations of Old Testament Scriptures by writers and speakers in the New Testament might be adduced,—all serving as precedent and example to us, to practice the scriptural precept (John v. 39), and to imitate the Berean example of SEARCHING THE SCRIPTURES. (Acts xvii. 11.) J. L. C. G.

INEVITABLE INCONSISTENCY.

The venerable Dr. Bachman, of Charleston, S. C., a Lutheran minister, at the installation of his associate pastor, Rev. W. W. Hicks, over St. John's Evangelical Lutheran church, in that city, in his charge said:—"As the mantle of an unworthy Elijah is about to fall on a younger Elisha, may it not be unattended with warning and instruction! . . . . . Forget not that these souls are committed to your charge; *that these little lambs must early be brought into the fold of Christ; that these young persons in the Sunday School, are to be led to the cross of Christ and taught the way of salvation.*"

Dr. Bachman is known to be a man of intelligence and piety, and no dobut deeply felt the words he uttered. The love of souls that leads the minister of the Gospel to pray and labor earnestly for their salvation, is inseparable from a true evangelical work.—What then have we to object to the words which we have italicized in the language of Dr. Bachman? Surely not that they urge the duty of watching for the souls of men,—of leading them, young or old, to the cross of Christ. But we see here again a strange inconsistency and contradiction so perpetually met with among Pedobaptists, among those called evangelical. According to the Lutheran creed,—as well as those of the other Pedobaptist denominations,—these 'little lambs,' these 'young persons in the Sunday schools,' so far as they are the children of Lutheran parents, are by their baptism already in the church, in the fold of Christ, at the Cross; for this is the very ground and support of infant-baptism, that 'the infants of believing parents have a right to church-membership, to Christ's fold and embrace, to the grace of his salvation and of his church, and therefore to baptism, by

Digitized by Google

which they are brought to all this. And now, after they, by this doctrine, have been thus, in infancy, brought into the fold,—we hear perpetually repeated by the pastors of these churches, that, when beyond the years of early childhood, these 'young persons,' 'these lambs,' must be 'brought into the fold of Christ' and 'to the Cross'! A more striking contradiction of theory and practice it is difficult to imagine. With one hand infant-baptism is held fast, and zealously defended; with the other all its ground and significance is thrown away. Why is this? Plainly because the entire teaching of the Gospel utterly ignores and contradicts infant-baptism; hence to follow the Gospel in laboring to save souls, this institution is necessarily left out of the account, and all this extreme inconsistency is superinduced. C. L. L.

LITERARY NOTICES.

THE CHRISTIAN UNITIST.—This is the title of a new "Weekly" published by Jones, Davenport & Jones, Crystal Springs, Miss. $3.00 invariably in advance.

It is edited by our well-known and venerable brother, S. R. Jones. It is "devoted to the defense and spread of the Gospel as instituted by Christ, and preached and organized by his Apostles, and to the restoration of Unity among the people of God." Brother Jones is an experienced veteran, and his heart beats with noble and generous desires for the prosperity of Zion. He is ably assisted by the beloved brethren Dr. W. J. Barbee, and Eld. B. F. Manire. We are gratified to see the enterprise with which these devoted brethren are rallying to the support of the good cause amid so many and severe discouragements, and pray that they may be abundantly supported.

First Principles of Geology, by W. J. BARBEE, A. M., M. D., Member of The American Association for the Promotion of Science, *published* by J. P. MORTON & Co., Louisville, Ky. This is a new edition of a work first published in 1861, and is especially adapted to High Schools and Academies. It is an excellent condensed presentation of Geology, in its present stage of development, and well suited to the use for which its accomplished author has designed it. The style is familiar, perspicuous and attractive,—the matter, from the latest and most reliable sources;

Digitized by Google

and the speculative conclusions, whilst they are characterized by the highest reverence for both scientific and scriptural truth, are drawn with a fearless logic that has no misgivings that there can be any harmful conflict between the revelation of nature and the revelation of the Word.

The "CHRISTIAN MONTHLY," By J. M. Pickins, Mountain Home, via Courtland, Ala. 32 pp. $1.50 per annum. "It aims to awaken interest in the study of the Scriptures, to teach the Gospel in its beauty and purity, to promote personal piety, union and activity among Christians, to oppose all unscriptural doctrines, practices, and organizations, and to regard matters of doubtful propriety with great care." These are high and worthy aims, and we wish for Bro. Pickins the highest succese in prosecuting them. The "Christian Monthly" is neatly printed, and its articles are written with much zeal and ability.

MISSIONARY MEETING.

TO THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN WEST VIRGINIA, GREETING:

At the State meeting of the Disciples of Christ, held near Sistersville, Tyler co., W. Va., in Sept. last, the undersigned were appointed a committee to arrange for a more permanent and efficient co-operation of all the churches of the State in the missionary work, and to call another State Meeting at such time and place as they in their judgment might think best.

We therefore, dear brethren, with the church at Wheeling, ask you to send up to Wheeling one or more delegates from each congregation, to meet us punctually at 2 o'clock P. M., on Tuesday, the 10th of May next, that we may confer on these matters.

Come prepared to say what your congregation will do the coming season for Missionary labor in the State, &c., for we wish to organize and put at least one general evangelist into the field at once. Bring up with you what means you can, and the rest can be gathered during the year. We hope that you will come prepared to do noble work for the Lord's cause, and that every disciple of Jesus Christ will pray most earnestly the Lord of the harvest to send more laborers into the harvest-field. Pray and work, and God will give success to the mission. Remember that the Lord loveth a cheerful giver and that it is the duty of each

Digitized by Google

one to do something to save sinners. Let the Elders or Evangelist see that this is read to the whole church, and after fervent prayer to God for the spread of the Gospel, ask each disciple to do something for this purpose, and God will bless all who make sacrifices for this, the noblest work on earth.

You will notice that the plan adopted at the General Meeting of our brotherhood at Louisville in October last, and now quite generally acquiesced in, for Missionary work, is so arranged that the strong, as the Holy Spirit teaches, "can bear the infirmities of the weak;"—the strong churches of a district are to assist those that are weak; the strong districts of a State are to assist the less strong; and the strong States, through the General Missionary Society, are to assist the weak States, and "sound out the gospel into the regions beyond," that "the earth may be filled with the knowledge of the Lord."

A. E. MYERS, W. K. PENDLETON,
DANIEL SWEENEY, DAVID ANGUISH,
EPHRAIM DOOLITTLE,
} Committee.

March 7, 1870.

Good Words from Our Correspondents.

EL PASO, ILL , Feb. 16, 1870.

BRO PENDLETON:—I believe this is the first time I have ever lifted a pen to write to the Millennial Harbinger. It seems strange that I have never written a letter to the oldest publication or periodical among us. I left here (home) the last week in Nov., '69, for Carmi, White co., Ill. I commenced a meeting there the first week in Dec. I found our cause low both in that place and in the surrounding country. While there, I had access to the Christian Baptist. In reading its pages I learned many valuable lessons. I saw the spirit that then actuated Bros. Campbell, Scott, and others of that period, who labored so nobly and fearlessly for the truth. I learned also the kind of opposition with which they had to contend. I find it to be the same which still everywhere exists against the truth. I see more clearly the necessity of contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, and of holding fast the form of sound words given by the apostles of our blessed Lord. I wish our timid, tame, compromising brethren would read the Christian Baptist, and imbibe its spirit. There is no success while we sympathize with error. Human philosophy and opinions of men, have made void the law of God. We must bravely sweep them away.

The Christian Baptist does not breathe the spirit of the organ grinders in the worship of God. It boldly advocates simplicity of manners,

Digitized by Google

as well as purity of speech and doctrine. We need some hickory men like the Campbells of those days, to battle down the inroads of this progressive age. Will you make a bold drive in the Millennial Harbinger, against modern woman's rights infidelity. The first attempt woman made to rule was in the Garden of Eden. All feel its consequences.—God said to the woman, "Your husband shall rule over you." Infidelity says it shall not be so. Raise your voice then against woman preachers, woman politicians, and woman suffrage. Do this for the honor of modest women and for the honor of our Lord.

I labored in White county up to this date. While there, sectarianism was rampant. In Carmi there were 85 additions to the congregation of the Lord. At other points, 22. In all, in White county, 107 additions, some of whom were from the sects, some reclaimed, but mostly aliens. To God be all the praise. Hallowed be His holy name.

Most truly your brother, JAS. L. THORNBERRY.

WHITE CLOUD, Nodaway Co., Mo., Jan. 28, 1870.

DEAR BROTHER LOOS:—I received the December Harbinger for 1869. I return my thanks to you and brother W. K. Pendleton for the ability with which you fill its ample pages. May God spare your valuable lives long for the great work in which you are engaged. * * * The Millennial Harbinger of A. Campbell should never cease its monthly visits to the Christian and the friendly alien, until the coming of our adorable Lord. It has done more than any other publication among us, for the propagation and defense of primitive Christianity. And shall we not expect that the great burthen of its labors is just now at hand? and that in the future, it will not only penetrate the dense mass of false theology but *even* the very Vatican of Rome, where smoke and darkness have enveloped the Bible for ages? Has not the Pope, and his wonderful Cardinals and Prelates great and fearful forebodings, for fear of those things that are coming upon them. * * * Brethren, continue to publish the M. Harbinger. Let the brethren strive to get it placed in every Christian family and in others. We love to read and hear of its circulation. for it has the ring of true metal. I think it gives no uncertain sound.

On the first Lord's day of Jan. 1870, I began a meeting for the Valley Congregation in the Southern part of Taylor Co. Iowa, which was continued for several nights, brother January assisting. The result;—much good seed sown among the people, and one noble man came forward from the Baptists. Also on the night before the second Lord's day of Jan. 1870, a meeting was begun at the School House near brother Jesse Lasswell's, in which several preaching brethren took a part,—brethren Hoover, H. January and L. D. Cook. The meeting was continued one week. One lady from the Baptists and three by confession and immersion were added to the Valley Congregation. The immersion which took place was attended by a large concourse of people, on account of one blind woman who was of the number to be baptized. She was young, and beautiful; but she was blind; she said she "could not have much happiness in this world, and therefore she desired the great salvation." I have not seen such faith, no not in thousands who have eyes. My prayer is, that she may live a holy life and be saved. God will give her eyes that will never grow dim, in that heaven prepared for her and all followers of the Lord. JEROME B. FRANKLIN.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; OR the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$ 25	Extra Cloth, - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edg s - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, - -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 0

Address allorders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. Va.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., APRIL, 1870. [No. IV.

LIFE—A FRAGMENT.

Life is the supreme business of man. God made him to live. He gave him intelligence and the revelation of nature, that he might know how to live here upon the earth; and, along with these, he gave him also the spirit of worship and the revelation of the word, that he might know how to live hereafter in heaven. Evidently life is an art. With some creatures, it is an art of instinct; with others, an art of highest reason. It consists in the perpetual adjustment of internal to external forces. No life is isolated—none is independent. The individual microscopic germ of power is enfolded by universes of forces, which it has to battle with,—if not in hostile joists of self-preserving resistance, at least with gentler wiles of cunning attraction. Many things it must throw off,—a few things it must assimilate. In both processes there is a ceaseless struggle. How to conduct this struggle successfully, that life may be the eternal victor,—this is the highest problem given to man.

The life of instinct is the brute's life. Its highest end is the gratification of animal wants, and its selection of means is determined through the agreeable reaction of matter upon the senses. The caterpillar seeks food because it is hungry,—to appease the uneasiness of an animal want; it selects the leaf of the mulberry-tree, because its odor and taste are grateful to its appetite. The end is immediate—proximate, and the judgment as to the means, not in fact a judgment at all, but a selection according

Digitized by Google

to the test of the senses. There is a desire for food, and a sense gratification, which says,—The food is good. There is in all is no reason;—it is the life of instinct. It is intuitive, immediate, sensuous. Does man, too, live this life? As an animal he does, and must. "The one universal soul, which by virtue of the enlivening Breath, and the informing Word, is common to all organized bodies, each after its kind,"*—has its expression and form also in man. The animal life is the one common life of organic being—a life of instinct.

In healthy infancy, this life is beautiful and perfect. The little child takes its food with gladness, and is happy. To lie upon its mother's lap,—to reflect the smiles that beam upon it from blessed eyes,—to thrill under passionate kisses of love,—to feel the energy of unfolding power, and shape itself to all external influences, in harmony with its own organization,—this is the crown and circle of its being and blessedness. Passive to all sweet influences, repellant of all that are hurtful, and individualizing by mystic sympathy of assimilation, whatever is necessary and conducive to the development of its own organization, it unfolds its germ of life into larger and nobler being. Its wants are its laws, and its senses are its test of the good.

But this life of childhood—of instinct—passes into the true life of man—the life of reason. With the quickening Breath of this common life, man also receives a true self-subsisting soul—a soul having life in itself,—individuality, personality, self-consciousness. We enter not into the deep question of Traducianism and Creationism,—whether the soul is generated or a new creation; but we are free to say that we think each soul a new creation, fresh from the eternal fountain of Being. Unstained, it comes to its incarnation, with rich stores of eternal memories, passing into cloud and silence for a while, to emerge again through inherent energy, glorious in brightness and eloquent in praise. But it is mated to weakness—the husband of the woman, ready to take of her the forbidden fruit, and to say again, as in the beginning,—"She gave it me, and I did eat." Thus we fall, and sin enters by violated law. The woman always gives, and the man always eats; and so, the soul passes under the yoke and receives the stain of guilt by its own free act, from which it shall be purified

* Coleridge.

Digitized by Google

only in the divine *palingenesis* that is through the blood of Christ and the renewal of the spirit.

The life of instinct is the soul of *matter*,—the life of reason is the soul of *man*. The former, if you please, is protoplasm; the latter is the gift of God. The one is complex—oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen; the other, simple—spirit, self-existent soul, being with attributes, but of indivisible unity. The one, subtends visual angles in the miscroscope; the other eludes all touch and test of instruments. The one is a nulceated cell, the product of antecedent life; the other an original creation, new from the hand of God. Protoplasm, granting all that the latest lights of science claim for it, presents us with no true beginning. If it be the physical basis of life—and I have no objection to the concession that it is the last analysis of the microscope so far,—though I would not be willing to say, with the history of such investigations before me, that it is the last that science can ever make,—but conceding that it is the physical basis of life, it is still only a link in the circular chain, which we call nature—a chain which ever returns upon itself—each link a cause and an effect, alternately protoplasm unfolding into organized life, and organized life passing through death back again into protoplasm. The basis of life—itself a product of life—a cunning temple of rare device, standing upon foundations laid in stones that have fallen from its own towers! Evidently there is no true beginning in protoplasm.

Much excitement has been created, and some pious alarm too, by the great Lecture of Prof. Huxley on "The Physical Basis of Life." We fear the old Theological spirit that sought to silence science in Galileo is not quite dead. We must not be afraid.—Sentinels of the night, sleeping upon their post at the doors of the temple, are startled by the Memnon notes, waked by the morning light, and in their dark ignorance, challenge even the Oracle to halt. It has ever been so. Not more than a century and a half ago, three or four students at the University of Jena, attempted to raise a spirit to guide them in their search after some supposed hidden treasures. They resorted to a close garden-house in a vineyard near by, and there, while engaged in their magical incantations, fell victims to the poisonous fumes of carbonic acid gas, raised from the dish of burning charcoal used in their experiment. One only was restored to tell the story, and the

Digitized by Google

sacred interpretation fixed at once the blame upon the devil. The black art was a part of the orthodox creed at the time, and there was no difficulty in ascribing the noises and specters which accompanied the progress of suffocation to the influence of the evil one. But Dr. Hoffman, who, if not the discoverer, was in advance of these doctors, in his knowledge of carbonic acid, said it was indeed an evil spirit (gas or geist) that had caused the death of these impious youths, but it was the spirit, not of the devil, but of charcoal! and that it would have been equally fatal to these young men, if, instead of attempting to raise the devil, as they were, they had been engaged in chanting psalms or burning incense to the Virgin. D.D.'s were shocked at this scientific infidelity, and even learned M. D.'s, in professional indignation, frowned darkly upon the audacity. Poor Dr. Hoffman! What could he do, against established ignorance. He had only to wait a little while, till this fresh beam of science rose above the mists of superstition, high enough for all men to see it. As a harbinger of truth he must needs pay for his honor by brief persecution, but it was brief:—the new discovery soon took its place quietly among the stars that shall shine forever, and nothing was overthrown but a little ignorance, and the black art which lived on it.

What if it should turn out that Prof. Huxley is only an early riser, who, waiting about the Temple, and listening with eager, expectant ear, has caught, in advance of duller watchmen, mystic sounds of revelation only whispered in the silence of twilight as yet, but soon to roll forth in swelling tones of utterance that all men shall hear! Let us not be afraid of Science. She is a true hand-maid of religion, and if she sometimes takes the Urim and the Thummim from the breast-plate of the Priest, and reads for us the answer of light, let us see and rejoice. Light is light, God is one, and all his revelations must be harmonious. It is our defective or false interpretation that makes the trouble. Studying the *word* and seeing as through a glass darkly, we say:—This is what God *means*. After awhile, another, by an independent method, studying *nature*, and seeing through a microscope clearly, says:—God means no such thing; and straightway we claim by divine warrant to cry, "Behold he blasphemeth, what further need of witness have we?" It is the old sophism of the bigoted Pharisee—the blind leader of the blind.

Suppose that protoplasm *is* the physical basis of life: as Abra-

Digitized by Google

ham Lincoln once said, I look out and cannot see that anybody is hurt. O, says one, this is materialism. Really I do not see it so; and I understand Prof. Huxley says he does not mean it so. This physical basis of life is affirmed to be a product of life.—Whence this first life? Is there anything in the field-view of the microscope that answers this question—that forbids the assertion of faith, which says, It comes from God? The oak comes from the acorn, and the acorn is the product of the oak. Whence this first oak? Without the microscope, as with it, we stand upon the closed circle of nature, and through it we see running in ceaseless round the energy of life; but whence came this energy? This, nature does not, cannot disclose. A physical basis of life is very far from being a logical basis of materialism.

So far, then, science presents to us nothing to be alarmed about. Let us freely open our minds to welcome her newest light. She is moving with stately mien through worlds whose only history is written in their own ruins; and let her tell the story as she deciphers it. She is peering into nucleated cells, whence rise and unfold the myriad forms of beautiful life;—let her bring out into common day, the hidden mysteries of the atomic chambers. She is besieging with armed eye the hosts of heaven, and by telescopes and spectroscopes grappling the orbs that tenant the outer abysses;—let us look up to the stars, and follow her in her triumphs. W. K. P.

ON HAZE AND DUST.

A LECTURE BY PROF. TYNDALL, DELIVERED BEFORE THE ROYAL INSTITUTION, LONDON.

Solar light in passing through a dark room reveals its track by illuminating the dust floating through the air. "The sun," says Daniel Culverwell, "discovers atoms, though they be invisible by candle-light, and makes them dance naked in his beams."

In my researches on the decomposition of vapors by light, I was compelled to remove these "atoms" and this dust. It was essential that the space containing the vapors should embrace no visible thing; that no substance capable of scattering the light in the slightest sensible degree should, at the outset of an experiment, be found in the "experimental tube" traversed by the luminous beam.

Digitized by Google

For a long time I was troubled with the appearance there of floating dust, which, though invisible in diffuse daylight, was at once revealed by a powerfully condensed beam. Two tubes were placed in succession in the path of the dust: the one containing fragments of glass wetted with concentrated sulphuric acid; the other, fragments of marble wetted with a strong solution of caustic potash. To my astonishment it passed through both. The air of the Royal Institution, sent through these tubes at a rate sufficiently slow to dry it and to remove its carbonic acid, carried into the experimental tube a considerable amount of mechanically-suspended matter, which was illuminated when the beam passed through the tube. The effect was substantially the same when the air was permitted to bubble through the liquid acid and through the solution of potash.

Thus, on the 5th of October, 1868, successive charges of air were admitted through the potash and sulphuric acid into the exhausted experimental tube. Prior to the admission of the air the tube was *optically empty;* it contained nothing competent to scatter the light. After the air had entered the tube, the conical track of the electric beam was in all cases clearly revealed. This indeed was a daily observation at the time to which I now refer.

I tried to intercept this floating matter in various ways; and on the day just mentioned, prior to sending the air through the drying apparatus, I carefully permitted it to pass over the tip of a spirit-lamp flame. The floating matter no longer appeared, having been burnt up by the flame. It was therefore *organic matter.* When the air was sent too rapidly through the flame, a fine blue cloud was found in the experimental tube. This was the *smoke* of the organic particles. I was by no means prepared for this result; for I had thought, with the rest of the world, that the dust of our air was, in great part, inorganic and non-combustible.

Mr. Valentin had the kindness to procure for me a small gas-furnace, containing a platinum tube, which could be heated to vivid redness. The tube also contained a roll of platinum gauze, which, while it permitted the air to pass through it, ensured the practical contact of the dust with the incandescent metal. The air of the laboratory was permitted to enter the experimental tube, sometimes through the cold, and sometimes through the heated tube of platinum. The rapidity of admission was also varied. In the first column of the following table the quantity

Digitized by Google

of air operated on is expressed by the number of inches which the mercury gauge of the air-pump sank when the air entered. In the second column the condition of the platinum tube is mentioned, and in the third the state of the air which entered the experimental tube.

Quantity of Air.	State of Platinum Tube.	State of Experimenal Tube.
15 inches	Cold	Full of particles.
15 "	Red-hot	Optically empty.
15 "	Cold	Full of particles.
15 "	Red-hot	Optically empty.
15 "	Cold	Full of particles.
15 "	Red-hot	Optically empty.

The phrase "optically empty" shows that when the conditions of perfect combustion were present, the floating matter totally disappeared. It was wholly burnt up, leaving not a trace of residue. From spectrum analysis, however, we know that soda floats in the air; these organic dust particles are, I believe, the *rafts* that support it, and when they are removed it sinks and vanishes.

When the passage of the air was so rapid as to render imperfect the combustion of the floating matter, instead of optical emptiness a fine blue cloud made its appearance in the experimental tube. The following series of results illustrate this point:—

Quantity.	Platinum Tube.	Experimental Tube.
15 inches, slow	Cold	Full of particles.
15 " "	Red-hot	Optically empty.
15 " quick	"	A blue cloud.
15 " "	Intensely hot	A fine blue cloud.

The optical character of these clouds was totally different from that of the dust which produced them. At right angles to the illuminating beam they discharged perfectly polarized light. The cloud could be utterly quenched by a transparent Nicol's prism, and the tube containing it reduced to optical emptiness.

The particles floating in the air of London being thus proved to be organic, I sought to burn them up at the focus of a concave reflector. One of the powerfully convergent mirrors employed in my experiments on combustion by dark rays was here made use of, but I failed in the attempt. Doubtless the floating particles are in part transparent to radiant heat, and are so far incombustible by such heat. Their rapid motion through the focus also aids their escape. They do not linger there sufficiently long

Digitized by Google

to be consumed. A flame it was evident would burn them up, but I thought the presence of the flame would mask its own action among the particles.

In a cylindrical beam, which powerfully illuminated the dust of the laboratory, was placed an ignited spirit-lamp. Mingling with the flame, and round its rim, were seen wreaths of darkness resembling an intensely black smoke. On lowering the flame below the beam the same dark masses stormed upwards. They were at times blacker than the blackest smoke that I have ever seen issuing from the funnel of a steamer, and their resemblance to smoke was so perfect as to lead the most practiced observer to conclude that the apparently pure flame of the alcohol lamp required but a beam of sufficient intensity to reveal its clouds of liberated carbon.

But is the blackness smoke? The question presented itself in a moment. A red-hot poker was placed underneath the beam, and from it the black wreaths also ascended. A large hydrogen flame was next employed, and it produced those whirling masses of darkness far more copiously than either the spirit-flame or poker. Smoke was therefore out of the question.

What, then, was the blackness? It was simply that of stellar space; that is to say, blackness resulting from the absence from the track of the beam of all matter competent to scatter its light. When the flame was placed below the beam the floating matter was destroyed *in situ;* and the air, freed from this matter, rose into the beam, jostled aside the illuminated particles, and substituted for their light the darkness due to its own perfect transparency. Nothing could more forcibly illustrate the invisibility of the agent which renders all things visible. The beam crossed, unseen, the black chasm formed by the transparent air, while at both sides of the gap the thick strewn particles shone out like a luminous solid under the powerful illumination.

But here a difficulty meets us. It is not necessary to burn the particles to produce a stream of darkness. Without actual combustion, currents may be generated which shall exclude the floating matter, and therefore appear dark amid the surrounding brightness. I noticed this effect first on placing a red-hot copper ball below the beam, and permitting it to remain there until its temperature had fallen below that of boiling water. The dark currents though much enfeebled, were still produced. They may also be produced by a flask filled with hot water.

Digitized by Google

To study this effect a platinum wire was stretched across the beam, the two ends of the wire being connected with the two poles of a voltaic battery. To regulate the strength of the current a rheostat was placed in the circuit. Beginning with a feeble current the temperature of the wire was gradually augmented, but before it reached the heat of ignition, a flat stream of air rose from it, which when looked at edgeways appeared darker and sharper than one of the blackest lines of Fraunhofer in the solar spectrum. Right and left of this dark vertical band the floating matter rose upwards, bounding definitely the non-luminous stream of air. What is the explanation? Simply this. The hot wire rarefied the air in contact with it, but it did not equally lighten the floating matter. The convection current of pure air therefore passed upwards *among the particles*, dragging them after it right and left, but forming between them an impassible black partition. In this way we render an account of the dark currents produced by bodies at a temperature below that of combustion.

Oxygen, hydrogn, nitrogen, carbonic acid, so prepared as to exlcude all floating particles, produce the darkness when poured or blown into the beam. Coal-gas does the same. An ordinary glass shade placed in the air with its mouth downwards permits the track of the beam to be seen crossing it. Let coal-gas or hydrogen enter the shade by a tube reaching to its top, the gas gradually fills the shade from the top downwards. As soon as it occupies the space crossed by the beam, the luminous track is instantly abolished. Lifting the shade so as to bring the common boundary of gas and air above the beam, the track flashes forth. After the shade is full, if it be inverted, the gas passes upwards like a black smoke among the illuminated particles.

The air of our London rooms is loaded with this organic dust, nor is the country air free from its pollution. However ordinary daylight may permit it to disguise itself, a sufficiently powerful beam causes the air in which the dust is suspended to appear as a semi-solid rather than as a gas. Nobody could, in the first instance, without repugnance, place the mouth at the illuminated focus of the electric beam and inhale the dirt revealed there. Nor is the disgust abolished by the reflection that, although we do not see the nastiness, we are churning it in our lungs every hour and minute of our lives. There is no respite to this contact with dirt; and the wonder is, not that we should from time to

Digitized by Google

time suffer from its presence, but that so small a portion of it would appear to be deadly to man.

And what is this portion? It was some time ago the current belief that epidemic diseases generally were propagated by a kind of malaria, which consisted of organic matter in a state of *motor-decay;* that when such matter was taken into the body through the lungs or skin, it had the power of spreading there the destroying process which had attacked itself. Such a spreading power was visibly exerted in the case of yeast. A little leaven was seen to leaven the whole lump, a mere speck of matter in this supposed state of decomposition being apparently competent to propagate indefinitely its own decay. Why should not a bit of rotten malaria work in a similar manner within the human frame? In 1836 a very wonderful reply was given to this question. In that year Cagniard de la Tour discovered the *yeast plant,* a living organism, which when placed in a proper medium, feeds, grows, and reproduces itself, and in this way carries on the process which we name fermentation. Fermentation was thus proved to be a product of life instead of a process of decay.

Schwann, of Berlin, discovered the yeast plant independently, and in February 1837 he also announced the important result, that when a decoction of meat is effectually screened from ordinary air, and supplied solely with air which has been raised to a high temperature, putrefaction never sets in. Putrefaction, therefore, he affirmed to be caused by something derived from the air, which something could be destroyed by a sufficiently high temperature. The experiments of Schwann were repeated and confirmed by Helmholtz and Ure. But as regards fermentation, the minds of chemists, influenced probably by the great authority of Gay-Lussac, who ascribed putrefaction to the action of oxygen, fell back upon the old notion of matter in a state of decay. It was not the living yeast plant, but the dead or dying parts of it, which, assailed by oxygen, produced the fermentation. This notion was finally exploded by Pasteur. He proved that the so-called "ferments" are not such; that the true ferments are organized beings which find in the reputed ferments their necessary food.

Side by side with these researches and discoveries, and fortified by them and others, has run the *germ theory* of epidemic disease. The notion was expressed by Kircher, and favored by Linnæus,

Digitized by Google

that epidemic diseases are due to germs which float in the atmosphere, enter the body, and produce disturbance by the development within the body of parasitic life. While it was still struggling against great odds, this theory found an expounder and a defender in the President of this Institution. At a time when most of his medical brethren considered it a wild dream, Sir Henry Holland contended that some form of the germ theory was probably true. The strength of this theory consists in the perfect parallelism of the phenomena of contagious disease with those of life. As a planted acorn gives birth to an oak competent to produce a whole crop of acorns, each gifted with the power of reproducing its parent tree, and as thus from a single seedling a whole forest may spring, so these epidemic diseases literally plant their seeds, grow, and shake abroad new germs, which, meeting in the human body their proper food and temperature, finally take possession of whole populations. Thus Asiatic cholera, beginning in a small way in the Delta of the Ganges, contrived in seventeen years to spread itself over nearly the whole habitable world. The development from an infinitesimal speck of the virus of small-pox of a crop of pustules, each charged with the original poison, is another illustration. The reappearance of the scourge, as in the case of the *Dreadnought* at Greenwich, reported on so ably by Dr. Budd and Mr. Busk, receives a satisfactory explanation from the theory which ascribes it to the lingering of germs about the infected place.

Surgeons have long known the danger of permitting air to enter an open abscess. To prevent its entrance they employ a tube called a cannula, to which is attached a sharp steel point called a trocar. They puncture with the steel point, and by gentle pressure they force the pus through the cannula. It is necessary to be very careful in cleansing the instrument; and it is difficult to see how it can be cleansed by ordinary methods in air loaded with organic impurities, as we have proved our air to be. The instrument ought, in fact, to be made as hot as its temper will bear. But this is not done, and hence, notwithstanding all the surgeon's care, inflammation often sets in after the first operation, rendering necessary a second and a third. Rapid putrefaction is found to accompany this new inflammation. The pus, moreover, which was sweet at first, and showed no trace of animal life, is now fetid, and swarming with active little organisms called vibrios. Prof.

Digitized by Google

Lister, from whose recent lecture this fact is derived, contends, with every show of reason, that this rapid putrefaction and this astounding development of animal life are due to the entry of germs into the abscess during the first operation, and their subsequent nurture and development under favorable conditions of food and temperature. The celebrated physiologist and physicist Helmholtz is attacked annually by hay-fever. From the 20th of May to the end of June he suffers from a catarrh of the upper air-passages; and he has found during this period, and at no other, that his nasal secretions are peopled by these vibrios. They appear to nestle by preference in the cavities and recesses of the nose, for a strong sneeze is necessary to dislodge them.

These statements sound uncomfortable; but by disclosing our enemy they enable us to fight him. When he clearly eyes his quarry the eagle's strength is doubled and his swoop is rendered sure. If the germ theory be proved true, it will give a definiteness to our efforts to stamp out disease which they could not previously possess. And it is only by definite effort under its guidance that its truth or falsehood can be established. It is difficult for an outsider like myself to read without sympathetic emotion such papers as those of Dr. Budd, of Bristol, on cholera, scarlet-fever, and small-pox. He is a man of strong imagination, and may occasionally take a flight beyond his facts; but without this dynamic heat of heart, the stolid inertia of the free-born Briton cannot be overcome. And as long as the heat is employed to warm up the truth without singeing it overmuch; as long as this enthusiasm can overmatch its mistakes by unequivocal examples of success, so long am I disposed to give it a fair field to work in, and to wish it God speed.

But let us return to our dust. It is needless to remark that it cannot be blown away by an ordinary bellows; or, more correctly, the place of the particles blown away is in this case supplied by others ejected from the bellows, so that the track of the beam remains unimpaired. But if the nozzle of a good bellows be filled with cotton wool and not too tightly packed, the air urged through the wool is filtered of its floating matter, and it then forms a clean band of darkness in the illuminated dust. This was the filter used by Schroeder in his experiments on spontaneous generation, and turned subsequently to account in the excellent researches of Pasteur. Since 1868 I have constantly employed it myself.

Digitized by Google

But by far the most interesting and important illustration of this filtering process is furnished by the human breath. I fill my lungs with ordinary air and breathe through a glass tube across the electric beam. The condensation of the aqueous vapor of the breath is shown by the formation of a luminous white cloud of delicate texture. It is necessary to abolish this cloud, and this may be done by drying the breath previous to its entering into the beam; or still more simply, by warming the glass tube.—When this is done the luminous track of the beam is for a time uninterrupted. The breath impresses upon the floating matter a transverse motion, but the dust from the lungs makes good the particles displaced. But after some time an obscure disc appears upon the beam, the darkness of which increases, until finally, towards the end of the expiration, the beam is, as it were, pierced by an intensely black hole, in which no particles whatever can be discerned. The air, in fact, has so lodged its dirt within the lungs as to render the last portions of the expired breath absolutely free from suspended matter. This experiment may be repeated any number of times with the same result. It renders the distribution of the dirt within the lungs as manifest as if the chest were transparent.

I now empty my lungs as perfectly as possible, and placing a handful of cotton wool against my mouth and nostrils, inhale through it. There is no difficulty in thus filling the lungs with air. On expiring this air through the glass tube, its freedom from floating matter is at once manifest. From the very beginning of the act of expiration the beam is pierced by a black aperture. The first puff from the lungs abolishes the illuminated dust and puts a patch of darkness in its place, and the darkness continues throughout the entire course of the expiration. When the tube is placed below the beam and moved to and fro, the same smoke-like appearance as that obtained with a flame is observed. In short, the cotton wool, when used in sufficient quantity, completely intercepts the floating matter on its way to the lungs.

And here we have revealed to us the true philosophy of a practice followed by medical men, more from instinct than from actual knowledge. In a contagious atmosphere the physician places a handkerchief to his mouth and inhales through it. In doing so he unconsciously holds back the dirt and germs of the air. If the poison were a gas it would not be thus intercepted. On

Digitized by Google

showing this experiment with the cotton wool to Dr. Bence Jones, he immediately repeated it with a silk handkerchief. The result was substantially the same, though, as might be expected, the wool is by far the surest filter. The application of these experiment is obvious. If a physician wishes to hold back from the lungs of his patient, or from his own, the germs by which contagious disease is said to be propagated, he will employ a cotton-wool respirator. After the revelations of this evening such respirators must, I think, come into general use as a defense against contagion. In the crowded dwellings of the London poor, where the isolation of the sick is difficult, if not impossible, the noxious air around the patient may, by this simple means, be restored to practical purity. Thus filtered, attendants may breathe the air unharmed. In all probability the protection of the lungs will be protection of the entire system. For it is exceedingly probable that the germs which lodge in the air-passages, and which, at their leisure, can work their way across the mucous membrane, are those which sow in the body epidemic disease. If this be so, then disaese can certainly be warded off by filters of cotton wool. I should be most willing to test their efficacy in my own person. And time will decide whether in lung diseases also the woollen respirator cannot abate irritation, if not arrest decay. By its means, so far as the germs are concerned, the air of the highest Alps may be brought into the chamber of the invalid.

PERE HYACINTH ON PROPHECY.

Before the Peace League of Paris, on the 10th of July last, this distinguished preacher, whom Rome has made efforts to silence for his faithful testimony to the truth, and who has excited so much interest in the Protestant world, made the following remarks, which we quote with much pleasure:

"In the present age of the world universal and perpetual peace is only a chimera. In the age to come, it will be a reality. For my part, I have always believed—and now in this assembly of my brethren, I don't mind telling the secret—I have always believed that in some nearer or remoter future, mankind would come, not to complete perfection, which does not belong to earth, but to that relative perfection which precedes and prepares for Heaven. After the fall of Jerusalem and Rome, and

Digitized by Google

the predicted end of the ancient world, the primitive Christian, heirs of the promises of Jewish prophecy, did not expect immediately the beginning of the heavenly and eternal state, but a temporal reign of JESUS CHRIST and His saints, a regeneration and triumph of man upon the earth. I also look for the arrival of this mysterious millenium, about which our errors of detail cannot shake the deep, unalterable truth. I look for it, and in the humble but faithful measure of my labors, my works, my prayers, I strive to prepare the way for it. I believe that nations as well as individuals shall some day taste the fruit of universal redemption by the Son of God made man. I believe that the law and the gospel shall reign over this whole planet. I believe that we—that you and I—shall see descending from heaven a manhood humbler and nobler, meeker and mightier, purer and more loving, in a word greater than our own. 'And this man shall be the peace!' *Et erit iste Pax.* (Micah 5: 5.)

"Over the cradle of our Lord JESUS CHRIST the angels sung, in the majestic beauty of that Christmas night, 'Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will to men.' And over the tomb from which he rose, the cradle of His new life, Christ says himself, 'I have overcome the world! My peace I give to you!' The future shall receive that promise of the angels, and that gift of Christ—the double hosanna of his cradle and his tomb. The future is the inheritance not of the violent but of the gentle. Then shall be brought to pass that other saying, written among the words that shall never pass away, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.'"

A DEMAND ANSWERED.

Some time ago our brother, Dr. Pinkerton, in the *Independent Monthly*, in noticing an article from our hand in the *Harbinger*, took exceptions among other things, to our speaking of the ecclesiastical organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church,—referring to the unlimited, supreme clerical control in it,—as an "ecclesiastical absolutism." The Dr. rebuked this as altogether unjustifiable, and held that it was rather absurd to say that such a thing as an 'ecclesiastical absolutism,' could exist in this land; and he desired to know on what we based such a declaration.—We felt that the well-known fact, cited again and again by the

Digitized by Google

liberal men in that church, of the Methodist Clergy having the entire control of the church in their hands, and which we had distinctly set forth in our article referred to,—was a sufficient answer to the Dr's demand. We have since come across the following passage from Judge Nelson's opinion, delivered in New York in the 'Church Property Case,' between the Church North and the Church South, at the time of their separation. We intended at the time our brother made the demand upon us, to publish this extract, but could not immediately then lay our hands upon it among our papers. The complete, irresponsible, uncontrolled dominion of the Methodist Clergy over 'the Church' is thus boldly delineated by Judge Nelson:

"Any body of ministers who have no constituents, and who represent themselves alone; who are the source and fountain of, and who embody in themselves, unrestrained sovereign, unlimited spiritual, temporal, and ecclesiastical power, and who are responsible to no earthly tribunal for the manner of its exercise; and who, in their first fraternal connection or conference, organized a Church, established its doctrines and discipline, appointed its authorities, superintendents, or bishops, ministers and preachers; and who had at the same time the same power to organize any number of Churches, with any forms of government that they chose; and they and their successors retaining perpetually all that power—could at any subsequent period, without violating any constitutional principle, modify, reconstruct, reorganize, and change its whole polity; or dissolve it entirely, and substitute in its place, two, or as many more distinct, independent Churches as they might desire.

"But this power in its fullest extent is, and always has been, posessed by the travelling Methodist ministry. In its exercise they, in the General Conference of 1784, organized the Methodist Church, established its doctrines, discipline; etc., and might at that time, by the same power, have organized any number of Churches, with any form of government that they wished.—Therefore, as that power remained undiminished, they could at any subsequent period of their labors, and at the General Conference of 1844 actually did, not merely reconstruct, but dissolve the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and substitute in its place two distinct, independent judicatories—so that the two independent Churches have taken the place of one."

We repeat here our words when we published the above in the *Disciple*, in 1852:

Digitized by Google

"Such is in plain words, the 'sovereign,' 'unrestrained,' 'unlimited' power of the Methodist ministry over the people. Dare any one say that *this* is emphatically Christian liberty? Is this the end and fruit of protesting against Rome? Is this utter annihilation and ignoring of all individual Christian right, and its absorption by conferences of Bishops, Presiding elders and circuit-riders, the perfection, the boast and pride of Methodist Protestantism? Is this dominion of preachers, who are independent of, above, and beyond the reach of, the people, the *liberty* of the gospel with which we are made free? It is the most admirable system in Protestantism, beyond all question, to gather, subdue, control, and govern immense masses of willing devotees; such it has proved itself to be. But its prototype is not to be sought for in the Apostolic Church. Its members themselves do not regard it as having the fixed, positive form of the Original Church."

That this great and absolute clerical hierarchy has become intolerable to a great part,—a majority perhaps, of the Methodist laity, and is by them felt to be an anomaly in Protestantism and in this free country is now evident. The free hearts, the enlightened men, of this laity will not tolerate this much longer; they know and feel that it is a tyrannous ignoring of Christian intelligence and freedom; that this is a repetition in the Church,—the Protestant Church, of the words of Louis XIV of France, when he said, "l'etat c'est moi!" '*I* am the State;'—and the Methodist clergy say, '*We* are the Church.' We think the demand of our brother is answered. C. L. L.

BRO. BURNS ON JOHN III. 8—AGAIN.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—The January No. of the Harbinger is before me, in which you accompany my brief letter on the translation and *interpretation* of John 3: 8, with some strictures. With unaffected satisfaction I received and read these strictures. I hope ever to be ready to receive any additional light on the word of the Lord with pleasure, no matter how it may affect my former position or interpretations. I entertain no *pride of opinion.* I seek *the more excellent way.* In your brief review of my brief note, you failed to have your attention directed to the *points* to which I desired more particularly to call your attention. On

Digitized by Google

reading your article in the Sept. No. on the subject under consid-ertaion, while agreeing with your translation of *pneuma*, and your translation generally of the 8th verse, I did not and do not think your interpretation correct. I do not think the present or "King James" phrase, "canst not tell," a good rendering of the original. A *literal* rendering it may be, and even *correct* in some constructions. But in the construction of the 8th verse, I do not think it a *good* or *perspicuous* rendering. My letter to you was an effort to give the reason for a preference of "art ignorant of," to "canst not tell." I wrote, as you say, in haste, and may have failed to make myself sufficiently intelligible. In looking over my letter, however, I cannot see that it is so.—Still, as your mind was not directed to the same points as mine, it would be easy to misunderstand the drift of my letter. This, however, you did not do very largely on the points to which your attention was directed. You did not, I think, very much misapprehend my conclusions, but could not see the relevancy of *my* conclusions with *your* premises. Well, I do not wonder at that. That in part is my trouble. I cannot get your conclusions from the premises contained in the 8th verse, without involving the consequences noticed in the last paragraph of your review. I have looked this matter over carefully again and again, and arrive on each trial at the same conclusion, to wit: Either your *translation* or your *interpretation* is wrong. Believe me, my dear brother, I would not for a slight reason disagree with either your translation or interpretation of a passage of Holy Scripture. I therefore agree with your translation of John iii. 8 (with the exception above). But as yet, I cannot agree with your interpretation of the passage.

I will not call up or animadvert upon your interpretation farther at this time or in this paper, but will endeavor to make myself understood. I set out with the assumption that Nicodemus understood perfectly the Savior's use of *pneuma*,—whether *wind* or *spirit* was in the Saviors' mind, so far as this feature of his declaration is concerned. The point on which you and I part company is therefore not on the Savior's use of *pneuma*. Your interpretation and conclusion requires the *comparison* noted by the adverb *so* to be that of *process*. And that the *process* of the Spirit's operation is in some way like the *process* or "whence and whither of the wind." In this view I do not concur. The ques-

Digitized by Google

tion with me is, Does the language of the Savior warrant such a conclusion? If it does, then my interpretation must be abandoned. If it does not, then your conclusions are fallacious.—From this standpoint it does not seem difficult to reach a correct conclusion. If *process* is in the comparison, it is not difficult to see that there must be objects or persons in the comparison also. Now if the *process* of the new birth is the *point* of the comparison, the Spirit is the agent or object. Then the objects of comparison stand thus: Wind, Spirit. *Process* of comparison stands thus: Whence and whither of the wind; new birth or regeneration. If this is not your position then I do not understand you; and you may transfer what you say of a man of straw to my page and we will call it a drawn battle.

The whole then turns on a fair and true exegesis of the verse. In order therefore to reach the disputed point, let us find first the objects of comparison. "*Thou hearest the sound,*" sufficiently indicates *one* of its objects. *Thou* certainly refers to Nicodemus understood as its antecedent. Nicodemus therefore is *one* of the objects in the comparison. From this I think there is no appeal. Nicodemus as an *object* can neither be compared to the wind or spirit. This single fact, to my mind, carries your interpretation and conclusoin out of the premises. The next clause requires *thou* understood after *but.* It would then read "but *thou* canst not tell." This use of the pronoun second person still has Nicodemus for its antecedent. On the meaning of this phrase, "canst not tell," the true interpretation of the whole passage or verse depends. I will therefore be at some pains to give my view of its meaning. In reaching its meaning I am not allowed the use of arbitrary rules or special pleadings. The rule by which I reach a conclusion is that, that lies upon the surface of all investigation. When we meet a word the meaning of which is doubtful, or the shade of thought designed to be expressed by it obscure, we take all equivalent, or a number of equivalent words, and from this test, get the shade of thought best suited to the scope of the passage and harmony of the associating thoughts. Precisely so I proceed with a doubtful phrase. And this rule I apply to "canst not tell." Does it mean that Nicodemus could not communicate it, or that he *he did not know it,* or *was ignorant of it?* Either expresses a condition or state of Nicodemus.—"Canst not tell" is incongruous as a point of comparison, be-

Digitized by Google

cause it is equivocal. "Canst not tell" may be predicated of a person for two reasons: First, He may be unable for want of the knowledge of words; or second, He may be ignorant of it. This latter no doubt was the true condition of the Senator of Israel. And this is the point of the Savior's reproof. "Art thou a *teacher* in Israel and knowest not these things?" The *manner* therefore in which the comparison is put, determines the shade of thought conveyed by the phrase "canst not tell." Nicodemus was ignorant of the whence and whither of the agent expressed by the the term "pneuma." Hence "*art ignorant of*," I take it, is a better rendering of the original than "canst not tell,—not any more literal, but more congruous, more in harmony with the scope and construction of the whole passage.

The balance of the passage is easy. "So is every on that is begotten *(gennemenos)* of the Spirit," the other object of the comparison. As you are, Nicodemus, to the whence and whither of the wind, so is every one that is begotten *(gennemenos)* of the Spirit. A closer analysis, however, will show more certainly the correctness of the foregoing exegesis. "So is every *one*," the *every* is a distributive adjective; *one* is an indefinite pronoun, and means "*person*," "man" or "woman," according to the gender of the Nominative. *That*, is a relative pronoun in the sentence under consideration. The clause, then, analyzed, would read, "So is every *person who* is (born of) begotten of the Spirit." The question now to be decided is this: Is it, or does the passage note, a comparison of *process*, or of *objects?* If the former, I am wrong. If the latter, I am right and you are wrong. I think our way is now clear. The word process means, "A proceeding or moving forward,"—from the Latin *procedo—pro*, forward, and *cedo*, to move. Now if the *process* of the work of either wind or Spirit were under consideration, the Savior's words not only inadequately express it, but express an exactly opposite conclusion. If language is to be taken at its current value, then we must look for something else than *process* in the comparison. If he had intended to note a comparison of *process*, he would have left out *two* very important words, to wit "*that*" and "*is*." And it would read, "So is every *person* born of the Spirit." "So is every *person begotten* of the Spirit." The passage reads, however, "So is every person *who is* begotten of the Spirit." The former of these sentences notes a comparison of *process, but it is not the language*

Digitized by Google

of the passage. Therefore *the language of the passage does not note a comparison of process.* The lattter of these sentences notes a comparison of objects; but *it is the language of the passage.* Therefore *the language of the passage does note a comparison of objects,*—the point to be proved.

I have not looked at consequences at all, nor will I. If there is a flaw in my readings, rules or reasonings, I know my dear brother will not be slow to point it out. And in the next moon I may *move* upon the *guns* of the President.

Most fraternally, A. BURNS.

CHAGRIN FALLS, O., March 15, 1870.

REPLY.

Dear Bro. Burns:—Perhaps we have already published more on the point we are considering than our critical readers will think it needs, but before dismissing it *as an overdone subject,* I beg the indulgence of all, while I add a "few more last words."

1. I do not understand that Nicodemus is compared to any thing. If he personally, is one object, and the man born of the Spirit, the other,—and the Savior is made to say that, "As you Nicodemus, are, to the whence and whither of the wind, so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit"—then the passage has no connection with the difficulty which it is introduced to remove. The Savior is replying to the astonishment of Nicodemus caused by the announcement to him of the necessity and possibility of the new birth. "How can a man be born again when he is old?" is the question of Nicodemus; "Marvel not that I say it must be so,"—this is the reply of the Savior. Can it be possible, that He then immediately dropped the subject, to say to Nicodemus, "thou canst not tell the whence and the whither of the wind, and the man that is born of the Spirit can tell no more about it than you can! You are ignorant of this natural phenomenon and so is the man who is born of the Spirit!"

2. I do not understand that "the wind" is compared to any thing. If the wind is one object, and the man born of the spirit the other, (and let it be noted, there is but this one object in the second member of the sentence,)—then we must understand the Savior as saying to Nicodemus, "the man born of the Spirit, like the wind, blows where he pleases and you hear his sound, but cannot tell, (or if you prefer it, are ignorant of) whence he comes

Digitized by Google

and whither he goes!" But who will say this is the meaning of these words?

But if the comparison be not one of these two objects, then it cannot be a comparison of objects at all, for there are no other subjects in the first member of the sentence concerning which anything is predicated. If then the Savior does not mean to say that the man born of the Spirit is like the wind, nor yet that he is like Nicodemus, with respect to the whence and the whither of the wind,—what does he mean? This I have attempted to answer, and if I have failed by what I have already written, to convince my dear brother Burns that my answer is correct, I do not know that I can add any thing further, to make it more satisfactory. It may throw some light upon the difficulty, however, if you will allow me to remind you that, when objects, as such, are compared, the resemblance must be looked for in the *attributes* or *actions* predicated of the subjects furnishing the resemblance. If the man born of the Spirit, as an *object*, is compared to the wind as an *object*, it must be like the wind in what is predicated of the wind:—If he is compared to Nicodemus, he must be like Nicodemus, in what is predicated of him. But to understand the comparison in this way, were beyond the gravity of sacred exegesis. But when the comparison is not of objects, as such, but of some similarity of their relations, then we do not look for the resemblance in the objects, but in their relations.—This we call analogy. This I understand to be the kind of comparison intended by the Savior. He means to say that the man born of the Spirit, or the new birth, (the concrete for the abstract), is to Nicodemus like the wind, (not as an object, but) with respect to the mystery of its procession, its whence and its whither, a matter beyond the reach of his understanding.—He can tell no more of the one than of the other. Why marvel then, since the processes of nature are as inexplicable as those of Spirit. You stumble not though you do not understand the *how* of the one,—why should you, because you cannot understand the other? Presuming that our readers can now clearly understand the difference in our interpretations, let us dismiss the question to their judgment, and pray for more light.

Very truly, yours, W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

THE CREED IN SCOTLAND—MR. GILFILLAN'S CASE.

We published some time ago an article from the *Pall Mall Gazette*, relative to the troubles arising in the Scottish church about the Creed—the *Standards of the Church*, embracing the Confession (Westminster), and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. That article referred especially to the general excitement in Scotland called forth by the *Coupar-Angus Heresy* case, the discussion of which in the Scottish press, religious and secular, and in the church courts, revealed a wide-spread, deeply-rooted defection from the old *Standards*, not only among the advanced literary men of Scotland, but also among the common people and the clergy. Scotland, as we said in the former article above referred to, was looked upon as the citadel of old Calvinistic creed-orthodoxy, long after the old creeds had broken down in the more southern Protestant lands. This new case—of Mr. Gilfillan—in the United Presbyterian church, gives additional proof that the people's understanding of, and attachment to, the creeds are passing through great changes, that are inevitable, and that show how vain was the claim for these creeds long made, as full, clear, reliable and authoritative developments and exhibitions of *the sum of Christian doctrine*. Mr. Gilfillan is a man of fame in his church, and in and out of Scotland, as a literary and religious writer,—a man of rare gifts of genius, and for all this highly esteemed in the church, that would not like to lose him as a minister and scholar. He is a free, bold, fearless, outspoken Scotchman,—one who enters with his whole heart into the movements and interests of human life around him, and who loves truth so much that the love and fear of creed, of church and brotherhood, will not make him mute, to conceal the truth in his heart, as many men of lesser candor and lesser freedom of soul, and love, admiration, enjoyment of truth, and of weaker manhood, are so perpetually disposed to do. Mr. Gilfillan is much before the public as a speaker and writer; and hence his convictions are soon widely disseminated over the land. This is what gave peculiar importance to his views about the creed, and occasioned the bringing of his case, at the instance of the Edinburgh U. P. Presbytery, before the Dundee Presbytery, for investigation. The case was gone into before a full Presbytery and a large attendance of the public.

Digitized by Google

The charges brought against Mr. Gilfillan, are given in the remit of the Edinburgh Presbytery, as follows:

"*To the Clerk of the U. P. Presbytery of Dundee:*

"*My dear Sir*,—The Edinburgh Presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church, at its meeting yesterday, resolved to 'simply transmit to the Presbytery of Dundee, to which the Rev. George Gilfillan belongs, the statements upon which Dr. Johnston's motion is founded, without any remarks thereon, leaving said Presbytery to deal in the matter as they shall see cause.' In conformity with that resolution, I hereby transmit, through you, to the Dundee Presbytery of the U. P. Church, the following 'statements,' which I give in the terms of Dr. Johnston's motion referred to:—'The Rev. George Gilfillan, of Dundee, in a letter to the *Scotsman* newspaper, of date Sept. 11, 1869, having stated—'I feel also, in common with many in the United Presbyterian Church, that our present Standards contain much dubious matter, and a good deal besides, about which there can be no doubt at all, being at once false and mischievous:'—having also, in a work recently published by him, entitled 'Modern Christian Heroes,' on the 302 and 303d pages of that work, asserted that 'our Standards are seen now to contain many blunders—blunders of Scriptural interpretation, blunders of natural philosophy, blunders of theological doctrine. They hold, or at least you can directly infer from them, such dogmas as eternal reprobation and the damnation of non-elect infants. They hold that the world was made in six literal days.....That any independent thinker, in this age of restless research and all-sided inquiry, can consent *ex animo* to all the propositions in a thickish octavo volume, or even in the Shorter Catechism, is simply impossible;' and having also, in a letter to the *Scotsman* newspaper, of date November 2:th ult., said of the Shorter Catechism, 'that, while a very excellent work, it is full of blunders.'

"Be so good as to lay the above before the Presbytery of Dundee at its first meeting. WM. BRUCE, Cl. Ed. U. P. P."

In this presentation, besides the general statements, only three dogmas are specified, as found in the creed and denounced by Mr. Gilfillan. Besides blaming Mr. G. for his general severe, denunciatory language against the creed, the Doctors taking ground against him seek to maintain that neither the language nor the dogmas excepted against by him, are in the creed. This opens a new and interesting field of discussion. Since Calvinism arose and was formulated into creeds, until lately, it was universally accepted that eternal reprobation, and the perdition of non-elect infants, —that is, simply, the perdition or damnation of the non-elect, were clear doctrines of Calvinism. While it is well-known that the belief of these dogmas has, for a long time, been becoming weaker and weaker, and the public teaching of them, especially

Digitized by Google

of the latter, was well-nigh extinct,—yet, that the Calvinistic theology and creeds do actually not contain these dogmas, is rather a new revelation to the present Christian world. Those familiar with the old Calvinistic Divinity of Scotland or of other lands, will not accept *such* an interpretation of Calvinistic theology or creeds. The truth in the case, as now shown, is, that the still attached friends and guardians of the *Standards*, are only, in their own case, changing the form of defection from the creeds. They reject the old interpretation of these, substituting new ones, modified more or less from the original ones; so really rejecting the latter; while such men as Mr. Gilfillan understand these symbols according to their original intent and the old interpretations, and so except against the venerable documents themselves, and do not attempt to get out of the difficulty, and save the character and authority of the creeds, by surreptitiously substituting a new acceptable interpretation for the old, now offensive and rejected one. We may here add, that not only the Calvinistic, but also the other old creeds of the Reformation, have met with this twofold treatment. Which of the two is the more candid and manly, every one will judge. The reader shall see for himself the way these Scotchmen, defenders of the creed, think and talk about the points of Calvinistic doctrine above referred to, and that mainly caused the controversy in the present case.

The Clerk of the Dundee Presbytery, Mr. Muir, opened the case in a long speech, in which he first gives the opinions of the leading men that are calling Mr. Gilfillan to account. It is interting to hear these men. On the first point, "eternal reprobation," he first quotes Dr. Johnston, "the prosecutor of heresy." Dr. Johnston says:

"I am not at present called on to prove that the doctrine of eternal reprobation is scriptural or unscriptural. Let that be distinctly understood. It is, Is the doctrine taught in the Confession? and I answer, No, it is not taught there. The words of the whole section, and to which Mr. Gilfillan refers but does not quote, are (see Conf. chap. iii. vii.):—'The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable councils of His own will, whereby He extendeth or withholdeth mercy as\He pleaseth, for the glory of His sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by.' I ask special attention to these words. They are that it pleased God—not to give over the rest of mankind to destruction by a decree of reprobation, but simply to pass them by. But to 'pass by' is not to reprobate. And then it is added that he ordains them to dishonor and wrath for their own sin. That is the

Digitized by Google

one cause of their ruin—to the praise of His glorious justice.—There is not one word of reprobation here, in Mr. Gilfillan's use of the term. There is no sinner condemned on a mere act of sovereignty." He perishes on the ground of his own sin."

Then follow two others:

"Professor Harper says:—

'Mr. Gilfillan said their Standards held, or at least one could evidently infer from them, such doctrines as eternal reprobation. Now, that expression occurred in none of their Standards. The phrase, he believed, would be generally understood to mean that men perished by divine decree, a dogma directly opposed to the teaching of their Standards, and which every member of that Presbytery, and of every Presbytery in the Church repudiated.'

"Dr. Andrew Thomson, Broughton Place, said:—

'In regard to Mr. Gilfillan's second matter of complaint against the Confession, that it teaches the dogma of 'eternal reprobation,' the phrase is so novel and indefinite that I confess myself at a loss to understand what he means by it. We all know that the Confession does not teach unconditional reprobation, and that such a horrid doctrine is repudiated by every minister and member of our church. It is repudiated by Calvinists in all churches. And what is meant by 'conditional reprobation,' which some suppose the Confession to teach, though not in those words, but that God, in the foreknowledge of the sin and persistent impenitence and unbelief of certain members of our race, decreed that they should not receive that eternal life which they put away from them. I can scarcely believe that Mr. Gilfillan would refuse his assent to this doctrine."

Such is the new and easy exposition of the Confession of Faith, now given by these doctors of divinity, and by which it is to be saved. The idea of eternal reprobation, once so high in esteem, is here by these modern calvinist divines even called *a horrid doctrine*,—and one repudiated by every minister and member of our church"! Thus has the glory of the old passed away! But is this interpretation of the Confession the true one? Is it true that "eternal reprobation" is not in the Confession,—and that such a doctrine does not belong to the Scottish church? The answer is given by the comments of Mr. Muir, the Clerk, on the statements of the doctors just quoted.

"Mark the term used concerning unconditional reprobation, it is 'a *horrid doctrine.*' The subordinate Standards express the sense in which, as a Church, we understand the word of God.—It is necessary that we cite passages of Scripture to which the Confession gives expression in the section where we have the doctrine of reprobation. I don't mind about the term if the thing be taught. I shall give an example of the passages: 'Therefore hath God mercy on whom He will have mercy, and

Digitized by Google

whom He will he hardeneth. Hath not the potter power over the clay of the same lump to make one vessel to honor and another unto dishonor?' Again, Jesus prays to the Father, and said, 'O Lord of Heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so Father, for so, it seemeth good in Thy sight.' Now, for the teaching of the Subordinate Standards—the sense in which the Church understands these Scriptural passages:—Confession, chap. iii., and 1st sec., 'God from all eternity did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass.' After the decree of election is given—sect. 7. 'The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath for their sin, to the praise, of his glorious justice.' Now, for the utterances of the Edinburgh D. D.s. We take the Professor of Systematic and Pastoral Theology first. He states that the phrase 'eternal reprobation' is not in the Standards. Granted, but he believes that it meant that men perished by Divine decree—a dogma directly contrary to the teaching of these Standards. Will the Professor be so kind as to put his finger on the opposed teaching to it in the Standards and give us the proof? I am afraid it will be very difficult for him to do so. Then the Professor, in a very oracular style, declares that that dogma every member of that Presbytery and every Presbytery in the Church repudiated. I hope the Professor will not deal in this wholesale style on this doctrine with all the ministers of the U. P. Church. The second Doctor—George Johnston, D. D., goes directly to the Sub-Standards, tells us the term "eternal reprobation" is not there, quotes the 7th sect. of iii. chap., when he comes to 'God passes by a certain number of the human family,' he exclaims this is not to reprobate. Who told the Dr. *that?* I think it is, and the teaching of the Confession is, that God was sovereign in the act. The Confession is, 'according to the unsearchable counsel of his own will.' It was unconditional, but not arbitrary, the decree to pass by, reject, and leave to perish a certain number of mankind. I hold this to be the teaching of the Subordinate Standards. If this be not the teaching of the Standards, what is it? And here I say the Dr misinterprets the language and the doctrine of the Westminster Divines. He says, 'it is added that God ordains them to dishonor and wrath for their own sin, *that* is the one cause of their ruin, to the praise of his glorious justice. (Applause.)' I wonder if this applause was derisive laughter at his misinterpretation of the language. I wonder what training the Dr had in early life, when he is not able now to discriminate the teaching of this clear logical section, 1st, God according to the counsel of his will passes by, rejects, leaves to perish the rest of mankind; *this* is the dogma of reprobation. Next, the doctrine is viewed in connection with sinners—those God according to his glorious justice ordains to punisment, namely to dishonor and wrath for sin. The decree of reprobation is the *passing by.* The

Digitized by Google

branching out of the decree is the ordination of sinners to dishonor and wrath. I go to authorities in proof of the teaching on these matters. As I cannot expect Dr. Johnston to attend to me, he will certainly listen to the late Dr. Dick, Professor of the United Secession church, under whom as a student Dr. Johnston must have been on this point. Dick's Lectures on Theology, lecture 36, page 195; text or subject of lecture, Confession, chapter iii. sec. 7—'I am disposed to doubt,' says Dr. Dick, 'notwithstanding the opinions of divines to the contrary, whether this purpose is any part of the decree of reprobation, which properly consists in passing by its objects or rejecting them. The dooming of them to perdition seems to belong to a different decree, especially as it is founded on a different cause. They were appointed to wrath for their sins; but it was not for their sins, as we have shown, but in the exercise of sovereignty, that they were rejected.' Whether is Dr. Johnston or the late Dr. Dick right? Judge ye. All that we have to notice of Dr. Thomson is his saying '*it is a horrid doctrine*, the doctrine of unconditional reprobation, repudiated by every minister and member of our church.' I might give statements on this subject from Jonathan Edwards and the late Dr. Wm. Cunningham, Professor, Free Church; but I take writers in our own church and of our own age. James Peddie, Esq., one of our most enlightened and judicious laymen, in a small compend on the Shorter Catechism, states that predestination, as regards the saved, is called election, not founded on faith or obedience, *not* arbitrary. As regards the lost, it is called reprobation, with the same explanation as before, and adds, decrees are consistent with human liberty, and with the free offer of the Gospel to every sinner. I now give my highest authority. You will find in Dr. Dick's Lectures, lect. 36, page 190. And are not the Lectures of Dr. Dick the text book, or were they not, of Prof. Harper? I might cite the whole of the introductory part of that lecture, but will only give a sentence or two, leaving you to consult it for yourselves. 'To reprobate is to disapprove or reject, and the term is used to express that act of God by which, when all mankind were before his omniscience, he rejected some while he chose others. Some are disposed to prefer the word *preterition*. But, although there is no reason for employing terms unnecessarily strong upon a subject which in itself is very awful, yet I do not see how we can suppose nothing more than a sort of inactive preterition, as there was undoubtedly an act of the will of God with respect to the reprobate as well as the elect. There seems to be no reason for denying that what is called reprobation was a positive decree as well as election.' I will give another sentence or so. 'The fall of man is presupposed to their reprobation, but it will appear that the former was not the reason of the the latter. If there was sin in the reprobate there was sin also in the elect, and we must therefore resolve their opposite allotment into the will of God, who gives and withholds his favors according to his pleasure. He hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.' Do Drs. Johnston, Harper and Thomson interpret the Confession aright, or has the late Dr. Dick done so? Again I say, judge ye."

Digitized by Google

On the subject of the damnation of non-elect infants, the Doctors speak as follows:

"1st, Dr Johnston says:—

'The second dogma to which Mr. Gilfillan refers is, as he calls it, the 'damnation of non-elect infants;' and on this I remark that this is only an inference of Mr. Gilfillan from the statement of the Confession in chapter x., section iii., and in these words—'Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit.' How Mr. Gilfillan can draw from these words the inference that non-elect infants are eternally damned it is not easy to see. They do not say that there are any non-elect infants. (Applause.) The utmost that can be thought of them is, that if there be any such they are lost. In my view of their meaning, there is nothing in the words inconsistent with the election and consequent salvation of all infants that die in infancy. I myself believe that all such are saved. (Applause.) But they leave the question undetermined, and there is nothing inconsistent with an honest adherence to the Confession in holding either side of the question.'

"Professor Harper says:—

'Another point was the damnation of non-elect infants. Mr. Gilfillan affirmed, others denied, that this might be evidently inferred from the Confession. For holding the affirmative of the question of infant salvation, he (Dr. Harper) did not suppose that any member of the Presbytery would bring, or wish to see brought, a charge against Mr. Gilfillan. There were decided adherents of the Confession who held that doctrine, but who decidedly objected to his inference. It was but the other day that Dr. Charles Brown, a most acute and candid judge, felt himself called upon to vindicate the Confession from the aspersion of teaching the damnation of infants, and to declare that if he had considered such to be its meaning, he could not have subscribed it.'

"Dr. Andrew Thomson states that:—

'He (Mr. Gilfillan) charges it with asserting that a certain number of children dying in infancy will be finally lost. I have no hesitation in avowing that, had the Confession appeared to close me up to that belief, I could never have subscribed it, and it is a mystery to me how Mr. Gilfillan, so understanding the language of the Confession, could ever have subscribed it. Reading his language in some of his communications, one would be led to suppose that this opinion was positively and dogmatically affirmed in the Confession; but it is a mere matter of inference by him, founded, I suppose, on the words about *elect* infants dying in infancy. But I am unable to see how such language necessitates such an inference. It implies, indeed, that all children dying in their infancy and obtaining salvation have been elected. But what is election but just the love of God formed into a purpose? and the language of the Confession leaves any man free to believe, if he will, that all children dying before they have 'sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression,' have, without exception, been eternally chosen to salvation.'

Digitized by Google

"Our friend Mr. Morton says:—

'In regard to elect infants there is not a word in the Confession of Faith respecting them any more than in the Scripture. But, it is said is the doctrine not an inference? Inference! Is an inference a dogma? Is not a dogma or doctrine something that is positively defined and taught? Mr. Gilfillan himself does not say that this doctrine respecting the children of unbelievers is one especially mentioned in the Standards. Many of his brethren do not infer the doctrine which he fastens on the Confession which shows that even the inference he draws may be wrong.—But whether or not since it is a question about an inference it is not a dogma, and it is unfair and untrue to represent it as such, and expend invective upon it.'"

To all this Mr. Muir replies:

"These are the utterances of our Edinburgh Divines on this second dogma. All tell us that the damnation of non-elect dying infants is not in the Confession. Professor Harper is very patronising to Mr. Gilfillan; tells him if he believes in the salvation of all children dying in infancy, that he and his brethren make no charge against him. This is very comforting, but Professor Harper gives no expression to his own views, the oracle gives no utterance, and says nothing of the teaching of our Subordinate Standards on this interesting subject. Dr. Johnston is more open; he admits the salvation of all children dying in infancy, and gives, I think, somewhat correctly, the teachings of the Subordinate Standards on the subject. They leave the question undetermined, and there is nothing inconsistent with an honest adherence to the Confession in holding either side of the question. This is rather queerly expressed. Dr. Thomson's deliverance we cannot well comprehend. We would dare to ask him had he examined the Subordinate Standards on this subject before subscription? One who talks so much about honesty will be very honest in his answer. Elect infants mean all children dying in infancy. All are elect. I thought election implied rejection.—I confess I have not the training to see otherwise. The utterance of our literary divine, Mr. Morton, is extraordinary. The damnation of infants is an inference. Dogmas are taught and are positively defined. An inference is not a dogma, and it is unfair and untrue to represent it as such and spend invective upon it. Does not our best and most logical reasoning come from inferences? What, can an inference from granted premises not contain a truth, even a dogma fixed and taught? Let us give this dogma in the form of a syllogism. Elect infants dying in infancy are saved. The correlative, non-elect infants are lost—*ergo*, non elect infants dying in infancy are lost—damned. Is there truth in this inference or not? Is it fair or unfair, true or untrue, to represent it as a dogma defined and taught? Do Drs. Johnston and Thomson and Mr. Morton not understand the meaning of the English language? Have these Divines forgotten all their logic? Now what is the teaching of the Subordinate Standards on this subject? Confession, chap. x. sec. 3—"Elect infants dy-

Digitized by Google

ing in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit." Then the fact that infants die tells us that they have inherited original sin which consists in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of original righteousness, and the corruption of the whole nature. This is all the teaching of the Subordinate Standards on this interesting topic, and I leave you to decide on it.—It has been told us that one of our late Professors, Dr. Lawson, a very wise and learned teacher, one under whom Dr. Harper was trained, said that the Westminster Divines shunned the subject of infant salvation. They gave no definite utterance on it.—Though I am not called on to express my own belief on the subject, what I have to do with is the teaching of the Subordinate Standards. Yet I go in for the salvation of all children dying in infancy, and come to it in this way. The evil entailed by the first Adam on the human family is all extensive. The remedy introduced by the second Adam is equally extensive. Adult man by believing obtains the remedy, non-adult men or children incapable of believing have the remedy applied, and in dying are saved. I think that is as exactly stated as any Professor or Dr. could do it. I was confirmed in this belief by the foot notes of one of the best books that could be put in the hands of bereaved parents of infant children—"Words of Comfort," edited by William Logan; I quote from the 6th edition, 15th thousand, page 17—"During the late controversy on the extent of the atonement, says Dr. William Anderson, having met Dr. Wardlaw in a book shop, and pointed out a passage to him in a book that morning, published by one of the opposite party, arguing the possibility of the eternal damnation of a certain portion of deceased infants, he said, 'that is frightful,' but added, 'I regret that in controtroversy with the Baptists I was seduced into the use of expressions savoring of a limitation of the salvation of deceased infants to the seed of the righteous. I abhor the thought, and am persuaded that this question of the extent of the atonement will yet turn on the question of infant salvation.'"

Of Mr. Gilfillan's short speech in his own defense, the following is the principal part, expressing his own and others' views of the creed:

"It has been suggested to me that I should make a short statement to-day. And this I cheerfully do, but with the proviso that it shall not be very long. My former statement is so recent and so explicit, and contains my sentiments in a manner I feel so little inclination to alter, that what I now say must be chiefly supplemental, as well as short, the more as the large minority in the Edinburgh Presbytery, by opposing any action in the case, seemed to ratify my statement."....."While making these statements and acknowledgments—while admitting that some of my charges against the Confession, and especially against the Shorter Catechism, were by far too broad and sweeping—I adhere still to the spirit of my remarks, which I would explain as follows:—I hold, then, that the Confessional documents are not inspired, cannot be infallible, although by a number of unthinking people they are

Digitized by Google

put upon the same level with Holy Writ. I believe that, while these documents contain the broader and more fundamental truths of the Gospel, well and (particularly in the Shorter Catechism) admirably stated, they contain a considerable portion of matter in which we see the defects of the theology of that age, and the limitations of the men—good and great men as they were—who compiled them. Besides the three points I referred to in my previous statement, and which, after all that has been said to the contrary, I still believe, and many believe with me, to be contained or necessarily implied in the Confession of Faith, Dr. Anderson has his four points, which he is ready to produce when required, and would, I believe, but for family and personal affliction, have produced publicly ere this. Dr. Candish has objected to the statements in the Catechism in reference to Sonship; Dr. Crawford, in reference to God's Fatherhood; Dr. Cairns, here coinciding with one of my three points, to its view of the Creative Work; Dr. Joseph Brown, if I am not misinformed, to its account of Baptism, as well as to its assertion that God made all things out of nothing in the space of six days—and so forth. Even my ancient friend and hall-mate, Dr. Thomson, while convicting me to his own entire satisfaction of grave heresy, has come not out scatheless altogether; nay, as has been wittily remarked, in approaching the furnace where I was supposed to be burning, he has, like Nebuchadnezzar's underlings of old, been himself singed, if not consumed in the blaze. (Laughter.) And Dr. Peddie's proposition to modify and abridge the Confession remains still in the memory of his co-Presbyters and in the files of the *Scotsman*—a gauntlet thrown down but not uplifted—and in a state of about as great vagueness and generality as my now notorious charges in the 8th chapter of 'Modern Heroes.' Nay, I have specified three definite objections. He has thrown a general slur over the whole document, which will remain till he has followed my good example. I ask, sir, is this a healty state of things, or one that should continue? Here is a Confession of Faith, one part of which one person disbelieves, another another, a third three doctrines, a fourth four of them, (perhaps every minister in our body) some single one, till, as in the famous Mahometan story, the whole hog is eaten up, and there remains nothing (except the leading principles) which is not by somebody or other in the church doubted or disbelieved. And yet still it is called the Church's Confession, and is bound (as Dr. M'Gavin was very particular to tell you) round the neck of every student at license, and every preacher at ordination—all of whom, whether they have read it or not (and many of them, I have heard, have not), are called on to say that they believe it. I think a new question should be inserted in our formula of license, 'Have you read the Confession of Faith?' Again, I hold that these documents should be periodically revised—an opinion in which I am delighted to have the support not only of Dr. Peddie, but of the late Dr John Dick of Glasgow—periodically revised, in order to fold round it, if possible, the results of advancing theological thought and Scripture criticism, and to represent not simply the beliefs of the past but those of the present. Do that with as much care and tender-

Digitized by Google

ness as you please, but by all means do it, and do it soon, else your very laymen will begin to talk, however unjustly, of inconsistency, and even (what we clergy should not and dare not do) of dishonesty, and of creeds being outworn, and of the whole thing being antiquated and anile, and of the Confession being a nightmare of the past instead of a noble and living mirror of the present, and be disposed not to amend and infuse new life into it, but to cry—'O, reform it altogether; raze, raze it to its foundation.' This is a danger that can only be avoided by a thorough and wise revision. And, in fine, I am here for us coming—gradually if you will, but coming certainly to the fixing of a few leading principles and facts as our creed. I know and could name some ministers in our body who would like to see the U. P. Church based in its belief on the same general creed as the Evangelical Alliance has long been. And without approving of this entirely, I think it a step in the right direction."

Mr. Gilfillan's case was dismissed on the easy ground that the creed did not teach the dogmas rejected by him, and by his declaring his adherence to the fundamental doctrines of the church, and regretting the occasional severity of his language.

In the discussion of this case in the Presbytery, the general sentiment of the people about creeds was, in one form or another, repeatedly brought out. In his *Modern Christian Heroes*, Mr. Gilfillan says: "Creeds and Confessions are far too large and extended. Our Confession of Faith is so long and elaborate, that some of those who are called to subscribe it may not have read it all; and others who have read it, have not mastered its contents." Mr. Muir, the Clerk, said: "Let me try to interpret the tendency of the age,—and I fear the Edinburgh Presbytery is encouraging that tendency. I am far from saying that it is a healthy tendency,—I am merely trying to interpret it. It is to throw overboard large, cumbrous, metaphysical, logical creeds and confessions, to select a few leading articles of the Gospel as a creed on which all Presbyterians may unite, leaving out all detail which may cause differences." Mr. Muir sees the logical consequence of such a course on the creed, which could not outlive it. "Our subordinate Standards," he says, "contain a system of divinity admirably arranged. Philosophically and logically compacted, of course a Calvinistic system. Take one pin out of it, and the whole fabric topples to the ground; leave out one essential, fundamental principle, and all are shattered." That is, the creed can not be changed to suit the "tendency of the age," and retain its identity; any material change destroys it.

Digitized by Google

So the old creeds are, one by one, breaking down. Their differential, characteristic attributes are sinking into decay and disuse. What may not another century, or even half a century, bring about, as regards human creeds, in this onward course of the rejection of the human,—of that which has separated the Christian world into hostile camps. All we see in this direction, gives us new confidence, and new courage in the grand warfare for the Word of God alone, to the rejection of all human *Standards* as grounds of faith and bonds of fellowship,—as authoritative rules of ecclesiastical and individual religious life. C. L. L.

MORNING HYMN.

FROM THE GERMAN OF SEUME.

Oh God, beneath thy wings this night,
Have I reposed in slumbers light;
Refreshed, on high I cast my eyes,
And watch the morning sun arise.

Where'er I turn my gaze, I see
Thy loving kindness unto me;
A song of praise be my first breath,
Thanksgivings be my strain in death!

Thy blessings, like an Ocean roll,
Around thy sons from pole to pole;
And fools alone ne'er call to mind
That they are men among mankind.

Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may
Enjoy Thy goodness through the day;
To me misfortune's voice be dumb,
But give me patience if it come.

Thy hand alone can blessings spread,
Pour blessings on my humble shed;
Oh let me serve my fellowman,
And aid him wheresoe'er I can.

A cheerful heart, an upright mind,
The brightest treasures of mankind,
I pray Thee, Father, give to me,
That I may go in peace to Thee.

Digitized by Google

A SUPPOSED DILEMMA ON JOHN III. 5.

BRO. W. K. PENDLETON:—I think that the position that you have taken concerning John 3: 5th, has led you into a dilemma, (of which, perhaps, you never have thought,) either horn of which, if pressed, would severely gore you. Pupils, sometimes, get their teachers into a close place. I love to read the things that flow from your very prolific pen; but I will "compare" them with the things that flowed from the pen of *inspired* man. If Jesus had reference to "Christian baptism" when he said to Nicodemus, "I say unto thee, except a man *(tis)* be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," He then preached a part of his own gospel to Nicodemus, before the the day of Pentecost, at which time the apostles began to preach the gospel, and even before he entered on his personal ministry; against which several objections might be offered. One is sufficient: Jesus was *then living*. Heb. 9: 15, 16, 17. But let me see something about the horns of this *supposed* dilemma.

Horn. 1. The disciples of John and the disciples of Jesus had not entered into the kingdom of God before the day of Pentecost. They had been immersed in water; but they had not been immersed in the Holy Spirit. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." No person is excepted from this law, not even the disciples of John the Baptist; nor even the disciples of Jesus, "whom he made and immersed." The day of Pentecost comes. Who is to preach the gospel. The apostles were commanded to preach the gospel to all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. Did they commence to preach it before they entered into the kingdom of God? They must be born of water and of the Spirit, in order that they may enter into the kingdom of God. Who was to *re*-immerse them in water in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins? for except a man (no person excepted) be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, refers to Christian baptism. Then, all the disciples of John and all the disciples of Jesus, were, if this interpretation of John 3: 5 is correct, *re*-immersed in water, in the name of Jesus, for the remission of sins.

Horn 2. The disciples of John and the disciples of Jesus had been immersed in water—"born of water"—before the day of

Digitized by Google

Pentecost. Jesus said to the eleven apostles just before he ascended into heaven, "John truly immersed in water"—they had been immersed in water by John—"but you shall be immersed in the Holy Spirit, not many days hence." Acts 1: 5. On the day of Pentecost, they, and perhaps, some others, were immersed in the Holy Spirit, and entered into the kingdom of God. Acts 2. "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table *in my kingdom*, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."—Luke 22: 29, 30.

Which horn of the dilemma will you take—either or neither? Will you say that the disciples of John, and the disciples of Jesus, were *re*-immersed in water, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; or, that they were immersed in the Holy Spirit, that they might enter into the kingdom of God? One thing is certain: that the twelve apostles, or the hundred and twenty disciples, were *not* in the kingdom of God *before* the day of Pentecost; and that they were in the kingdom of God the day *after* Pentecost. They were *not*, on that day, or the day of Pentecost, immersed *in water;* but they were, *on the day of Pentecost*, immersed in the Holy Spirit. Then, how did *they* enter into the kingdom of God? *This question needs no answer.*

I think it something strange, that if "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit" refers to "Christian baptism," no apostle—not even John himself, who recorded the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus—ever referred to it when preaching the gospel of Christ, the power of God unto salvation. Peter did not, on Pentecost, tell them who asked him "What shall we do?" that they must be born of water and of the Spirit, that they might enter into the kingdom of heaven. He preached to them repentance and remission of sins—he commanded them to repent and be immersed into remission of sins—that their sins might be sent away on the antitype of the scape-goat. The scape-goat bore away *yearly* the sins and iniquities of the Jewish nation into "*the wilderness.*" "John preached *in the wilderness* of Judea the baptism of repentance into the sending away of sins." A Jew understood how sins were sent away on the scape-goat.

"When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made (makes) and baptized (baptizes) more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not but his disciples

Digitized by Google

[baptized],) He left Judea, and departed again into Galilee." Jno. 4: 1, 2, 3. John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb (Lu. 1: 15). Jesus received the Holy Spriit when he was immersed by John (Matt. 3: 16). The twelve apostles received the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. John the Baptist made and baptized disciples; Jesus made and baptized disciples; and Peter made and baptized disciples. The disciples whom Peter made and baptized, were born of water and of the Spirit; but the disciples whom John and Jesus made and baptized, were *not* born of water and of the Spirit! How did Peter excel Jesus in making and baptizing disciples? Jesus had received the Holy Spirit without measure; and yet it appears that Peter excelled him in making and baptizing disciples! If the three thousand who gladly received Peter's word and were baptized, were born of water and of the Spirit, why were not they whom Jesus baptized born of water and of the Spirit *too?* Some things I can understand, and others I can not. I can not understand why the disciples whom the apostles made and baptized, were born of water and of the Spirit; and the disciples whom Jesus made and baptized were not born of water and of the Spirit. Jesus said: "I have given them thy word (ton logon sou); and the world hath hated them, because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." John 17: 14. Why the word of God was more powerful when preached by the apostles, than it was when preached by Jesus himself, I cannot understand. Perhaps the time and place gave it efficacy.

If Nicodemus had applied to Jesus to be baptized, would Jesus have baptized him; or would he have told him to wait till the day of Pentecost, when he could receive "Christian baptism"—"be born of water and of the Spirit?" I *think* that Jesus would have baptized him in water, and told him that he would be baptized in the Holy Spirit at some future day. It seems that Jesus made and baptized disciples during John's ministry. I. N. S.

REPLY.

DEAR BRO. S....:—It gives me great pleasure to hear from you, and to find that you are still a diligent student of the word. May God bless you, and lead you into all truth. It is good for us to "compare spiritual things with spiritual." It is the only

Digitized by Google

method by which we can truly know the mind of God. But to do this, with accuracy, two things are necessary;—first, we must accurately know the things which we compare; second, we must clearly apprehend in what point the resemblance consists. The former of these conditions requires a close critical examination of the *words* of revelation, for words are signs of things and ideas; the latter demands a correct understanding of the connection of thought—the drift of the propositions which are brought into relation with each other.

But a critical examination of the *words* of revelation requires us to go back to the original language of the Holy Spirit. We must be sure of what the Holy Spirit has *said*, before we can be sure of what he *means*. You will see, therefore, that the common fashion of disparaging "learned criticisms on Greek subjects and predicates," is one of the shallowest conceits and subterfuges of ignorance. There can be no reliable synthesis, without first, a thorough analysis. Generalizations made upon any other than a thorough examination of all the particulars, is at the best only a venturous *guess* at the truth. We must *hold fast the form of sound words*, when we undertake to interpret the mind of the Spirit.

You think you find in my position concerning John 3: 5, a *dilemma*, of which I "have never thought." I have thought much of the *subject* of this verse, but I confess I have never felt any apprehension of the "supposed horns," which you see in the case. Nor is my apprehension increased by your ingenious effort to invest them with the power of "goring" me. You say, "If Jesus had reference to Christian Baptism when he said to Nicodemus, Unless a man be born of water, &c., he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven, then He preached a part of his gospel before the day of Pentecost;" and you conclude that this could not be so, because "Jesus was then living." But I cannot see the force of your logic. Did not Christ proclaim many things concerning "the kingdom" while he was yet living? His life was, in fact, spent in preparing for the formal opening of "the kingdom," which took place on the day of Pentecost. This was also the great burthen of the ministry of John the Baptist. His cry was, "Repent ye, for the kingdom of Heaven is at hand." He preached "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." His preaching was "the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord." Why should it be thought

Digitized by Google

strange, then, that in this preparatory dispensation, many things should be said prospectively, as to the kingdom, which was soon to be fully and formally inaugurated? Could there, in fact, be any proper preparation for entering it, without such instruction?

Let us look at this "supposed dilemma." We must not seek to be wise above what is written. John the Baptist, reasoning from the consciousness of his own inferiority, thought that the Savior had no need of baptism at the hands of his Harbinger,—and his logic was apparently fully as conclusive as is much upon which some men, in the present day, base their dogmas of exemption;—but the Savior taught him better, and he submitted to his teaching. So let us take the Savior's interpretation of his own words, and lower our impaling dilemmatic "horns" before his authority. It is true that our Savior's language to Nicodemus,—"Except a man be born of water," &c.—is general, but not so absolutely and necessarily universal, as to destroy His own power to qualify it, so as to make an exception of the apostles, and perhaps the 120 who were with them on the day of Pentecost. While it is the *general law* of admission into the kingdom, it does not follow that it is to be applicable to those who shall be called and appointed to be the agents in introducing the new reign. All things, you know, begin in miracle. Without one be born of father and mother, he cannot enter into this world; yet Adam and Eve did not so enter it. There is no oak that does not spring from an acorn, yet the *first* oak did not so originate. So no one shall enter the kingdom of heaven unless he be born of water and of Spirit; and yet the first members, the original agents in setting up and organizing this kingdom, received their title not only to found it, but to enjoy its blessings, immediately from Christ, and not mediately, through the ministry of others, and the instrumentality of ordinances of admission. This is the case in founding earthly kingdoms. The founders of this free republic of the United States, did not enter upon the rights of citizenship through the forms of naturalization, which were afterwards required of foreigners. If it pleased the Savior to proceed thus in establishing his kingdom, who shall push against his free and expressed act with the "horn" of a dilemma. The fact speaks for itself—let it stand.

Besides,—Does your second horn help to remove the difficulty? If the Savior, in his reply to Nicodemus, meant by "born of wa-

Digitized by Google

ter," the baptism of John, and by "born of the Spirit," the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which took place on the day of Pentecost, then, since the declaration is general, a baptism of the Holy Spirit, similar to that on the day of Pentecost, is necessary to the new birth now; for it is still necessary to be born again. But upon this theory—who, since the days of the apostles, has been born again? Is it not a new discovery in theology to make "the birth of the Spirit" the same thing as "the baptism of the Spirit?" We thus dispose of both your first and second "horn," by showing that they are, after all, only embryo-horns of the brain, with no power to push or gore any one. The apostles, and those who with them were baptized of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, were not re-baptized, for reasons peculiar in their case, as the selected nucleus and prime ministers of the new kingdom; and since the great Head of the church did not require it, let us not puzzle our brains any farther on the subject. When Peter, somewhat officiously perhaps, asked the Savior concerning John, "Lord, what shall this man do?" Jesus said to him, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? Follow thou me." The lesson is not without its profit to many over curious questioners in the present age.

You think it strange, that if "except a man be born of water" means "Christian baptism," no apostle ever referred to it when preaching the gospel. But is not this a mere technical objection? It is true that this identical expression was not used, but *baptism* was preached, and the *gift of the Holy Spirit* was preached. The change, too, which took place in the penitent subject of baptism, is designated by terms, evidently referring to the language of the Savior. Paul speaks of himself as one *born* out of due season; Peter says, "As new born babes, desire the sincere milk of the word;" and in Romans (vi. 4) it is said, "We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." But more strictly parallel in thought and expression than any of these, is the passage in Tit. iii. 5: "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us richly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life."

I do not think, my dear brother, that we can understand many

Digitized by Google

things, that are involved in the development of the glorious plan of redemption which is revealed and offered to us in the gospel. The why and the wherefore of the economical arrangements of God is not a matter that we need be *anxious* about. It may indeed excite in our minds some of the most interesting speculations which can ever engage our thoughts, yet, while we may think with freedom, we must be careful to distinguish between the conclusions which we reach in this way, and the authoritative precepts of the Word. Why the Holy Spirit was not given while the Savior was yet on the earth, is expressly stated. Our Savior says, "If I go not away the Comforter will not come to you; but if I depart, I will send him to you." Again he says, "He that believeth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water," "speaking," says John, "of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet *given;* because that Jesus was not yet glorified." Here the *why*, is also given in express language. Let us be satisfied with it. It has been God's plan to unfold his will and his blessings to us through different dispensations, and we should not confound them, but labor rather, rightly to divide the word. It seems that while the Logos—the Word incarnate—was present on the earth, and in person arranging for the consummation of our redemption, it was not fit that the Holy Spirit should be given; the dispensation of the Spirit could not with propriety be introduced till the work of redemption had been completed, and this was the peculiar work of the Son—the Word incarnate. The disciples of the Savior received his word, and felt the power of the divine life, but still not in that fullness of spiritual consciousness which was afterwards experienced through the indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit. Hence it was *expedient* for them, that Christ should go away, and that the Comforter should come. Before the gift of the Spirit, Peter was weak, and denied the Savior; after it, he became strong, and went to glorious martyrdom for His name. These are arrangements of the divine government, on which we have only a few hints, and which we dare not irreverently scan,—but the little light that is given, reveals a glory which we desire more fully to contemplate. To this end, let us, as fellow-students, help one another, comparing spiritual things with spiritual, and the light of the Spirit will shine upon us and give us knowledge.

Fraternally yours, W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

LETTERS FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

LETTER V.

DEAR BRO. LOOS:—The great wide sea is scarcely ever tranquil, but keeps turning up its mire and monsters. We have had considerable agitation over the consecration of Dr. Temple as a bishop. He was one of the authors of the notorious Essays and Reviews, though certainly his Essay, on the Education of the World, was the most harmless of the series. But Evangelicals and High Churchmen have been equally scandalized by his appointment to the Episcopate, and there has been a considerable amount of screaming. After discovering that they could not take the purple robe and lawn sleeves from the Infidel Bishop of Natal, they might as well have been quiet. Temple's rose is but faint, when compared with the deep crimson of Colenso. However the appointment pleases the Broad Church highly, which party comprises such men as Maurice and Kingsley, many of them renowned for mental force and second to none in elevation of character; but the theology of the party is in a very nebulous condition. An Evangelical whose letter I have just read, says that the appointment of Temple, 'tolls the death bell of the Church of England.'—Though doubtful as to the truth of this, yet I hope it may be so. I could like very much to hear that bell ringing. It would be nothing like a funeral bell. It would be more like Tennyson's bell, which is to ring *out* the old evil things and ring *in* the new in freedom, life and glory. You may see them trooping—the mitred hypocrisy and atheism, the stalled stolidlty purple with fat and port-wine, the ecclesiastical rancor and spiritual pride. From Cathedral glooms and old cloisters, lo, the ravens on rapid wing, to seek more congenial darkness, are rushing mad and terrified as if they had heard the horn of Astolpho. It will come—but not yet. In fact State Churches may live almost up to that time which one with more vision than Tennyson or Ariosto has painted, when the Lord who once shook the earth from Sinai will *once more* shake not earth only but also heaven—that the things which cannot be shaken may remain, and that we may receive an immovable kingdom.

The cauldron seems to be frequently boiling over in Paris, and phantoms by no means comely are frequently seen in the smoke.

Digitized by Google

The murder of the Journalist Noir by a Prince of the royal blood has intensified the disquiet already prevailing.

A strange people are the people of that mighty nation, France —the electric battery of Europe. From tyranny to license—from the Sword of the Dictator to the Guillotine of the rabble—how the pendulum swings back and forward. The trees of liberty which they stick in the ground in seasons of liberty so called, were symbolic for they take no root and bear no fruit;—a surging back and forward between the dungeon of the Despot and the lamp-post of the sans culotte. We manage things better both in our Old Country and in your great Republic. Something depends upon blood—and something upon religion—for the Celt and the Romanist cannot lay as firm hold upon genuine freedom as the Anglo-Saxon and the Protestant. If we were compelled to make a choice between tyranny and license, we should be in great distress; for the galley-slaves who are chained to the oar and the Savages who burn each other's wigwams in the forest, are almost equally wretched. Something has been done to idealize the latter by your Cooper and some other Novelists, but their paintings are not faithful to life—not grounded in realism.

But after all, the divinest sort of freedom is that holy liberty which serfs and free men can enjoy in common. Remove the burdens from heart and conscience—establish the central peace of God in the assurance of forgiveness, the bulwarks of providence, and the certainty of everlasting life, and you have indeed freedom where these verities are reigning. I was almost saying which serfs and free men can *equally* enjoy; but that would not have been true. Religion thrives best under conditions of freedom. It requires such soil and atmosphere for perfect development. There is a richness of enjoyment, a ripeness of moral culture possible to the free Christian man, which the serf or the slave could never realize. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there there is liberty; and what a liberty it is! Beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord. It is under the Sun of that freedom that the fruits of immortality ripen, and the garden of the Lord has the blooms of Paradise.

Modern Judaism is likewise in agitation in our country. The most intelligent, and perhaps the most devout of the Jews are pleading for reformed ritual. It appears that their liturgy is ar-

Digitized by Google

tificial, rhetorical, florid and hyperbolical,—contrasting, in these respects, very unfavorably with the liturgy of our National Church, which is marked by purity of taste, in tenderness, solemnity and majestic simplicity. Some of the pleas of the Hebrew reformers are worth quoting. One says: "In all our approaches to the Almighty, the more simple our imperfect praises are, the more chaste the expression of our wants, the deeper do the praise and the prayer lay hold of our nature. What is termed the Lord's prayer, which Grotius shows to be made up of scriptural verses and gemmed utterances of the Talmud, is a prayer so simple that a child, in whom the first gleams of reason dawn, can understand it; and it is the very model of a Jewish prayer. I accept the choice specimen given by the 'Student of Hebrew Literature,' of what he calls the vapid and watery hymns of Church and Chapel:—

'Just as I am, without one plea
But that thy blood was shed for me,
O Lamb of God, I come, I come.'

This is—minus the dogma—my very idea of prayer. This was Rabbi Akiba's notion, who let others pile up the agony. His prayer was, 'O Father, I have sinned before Thee, and Thee alone I acknowledge;' and this prayer was answered, while the others were rejected. Prayer should be the spontaneous outpouring of the heart to suit the want, the occasion of either adoration or supplication. When the Hebrew language ceased to be the vernacular, and the services of the olden time changed, wise, good and great men composed prayers and praise as nearly allied to spontaneous effusions as well could be. In this simple, unadorned, and therefore eloquent and touching style, the statutory prayers are written. Men never pray in acrostics, in anagrams, in chronograms, in mystic phrase, where their hearts pray, or their minds are lifted up by thoughts that fill their whole being. I do think—it may be bad taste—that the words of the hymn quoted are exquisite; and the idea is as poetical as the terms are eloquent. They imply, 'God, on thy love alone I throw myself. I have no merit of my own. I have no plea to advance but the conviction that I can depend upon a love exhibited for my sake, and for my behoof.' This is just what the language of prayer should be. If this is vapid and watery, I prefer it in style to the *Piyut*, with its rich entablature, and traces of hyperbolism.

Digitized by Google

I repeat, that the *Piyut* is anti-Jewish. It is both that, and anti-social. It is filled with revilings and cursings, the very opposite of our older form of prayers; it is loaded to distress with angel worship and devilry; it inculcates the dogma of mediation; it personifies the Supreme under every possible guise; its whole complexion is one of attribution;—all antagonistic to Judaism.—It is said, great and good men permitted it. Was there ever any one error yet in the world, but what great and good men supported? Let science, morality, politics and religion give up their dead, and how abashed the dead would be at the exploded truths, *so-called* and so worshiped in each domain. Like the sleeper of the Talmud, they would find the world changed, their wisdom turned to folly—and they would pray to sleep again the wakeless sleep of the dead."

Another writer on the same side says: "David and Jeremiah did not write acrostics. Many of the verses of their writings are arranged in alphabetical order, but they never attempted to insert their names, either by letters or numbers, in their compositions: they certainly never would have cramped their glorious ideas, their matchless language, by such an endeavor. Why should our Ritual be an embodied conundrum. You know that such cunning avails nothing before God. Bolstering up a ritual which is meaningless, advocating a round of synagogal observances which have ceased to be a service; compelling the use of a prayer-book which contains little prayer, and much extraneous and indifferent matter,—these are grievous faults. But any attempt to combine—not, God forbid, the doctrine of the religion—but its external observances with the spirit of the age, is looked upon as daring sacrilege. The sages of the Mishna were wise in their generation. Any observance which had outlived its meaning was relentlessly abolished. It is reserved for this age to make religion hateful and distasteful to the many, to make the synagogal service the service of the few, and by refusing reasonable concessions, to make attending synagogue an irksome duty to some—an insurmountable obstacle to others. It is necessary to have a cry, and the 'church is in danger' is in every sense an imposing but a meaningless one. Our church, like its author, is an eternal one, not to be injured or weakened by removing the *piytim* or other excrescences which cling to it. God will take care of his own without the officious assistance of those who pretend to be possessed of His

Digitized by Google

knowledge and conversant with his most secret council. Nothing can be gained by supporting medieval institutions for no other reason than that they have been endured for eight or ten hundred years. The same argument might be used to tolerate a sandbank at the mouth of an otherwise navigable river; to perpetuate the mud which chokes a well—or any other nuisance or obstruction."

There is interest in the utterances of these Jewish reformers—not only intrinsic, but to us relative and suggestive; for in fighting our own battle with hoary traditions we have met the like formidable phantoms, and have had to clear our path in a very similar manner. I suspect, however, that Grotius was only in a Dutch fog when he endeavored to find the source of the Lord's prayer in "*gemmel utterances of the Talmud.*" I know the man well, from an early reading of his works. He never cared to walk the golden streets of the New Jerusalem, or any starry path of supernaturalism, if he could find on lower ground a dusty common, or even a swamp, to plod through.

But, dear Bro. Loos, I must conclude this long letter by love to Bro. Pendleton and all inquirers, and remain

Faithfully yours, G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, 19th Jan., 1870.

POSTSCRIPT.—We have had in our town a grand Greek church opened for worship. The consecration performed by a foreign Archbishop, with a pomp of ceremonialism bordering on heathenism. As one of the ominous signs of the times, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York both represented by clergymen of our National Church. There was likewise a deputation from a certain party in the Church of England who are seeking a basis for union between the Anglican and the Eastern Church. When we know that all the superstitions of the Papacy are found in the Greek Church, with the solitary exception of the Pope's supremacy, we can understand the meaning of such spiritual politeness and ecclesiastical courtship. The men who are seeking the union belong substantially to Rome, and have already undermined the Anglican Church, so far as her Protestantism is concerned.

There is, however, in the whole movement, a confession of disorder and ruin and weakness—a blind groping after some lost unity, which distinguished the ancient day with superhuman radiance, and gave rare power and force to all appeals to the world. G. G.

Digitized by Google

OUR AIMS AND POSITIONS.

[We discover from the local Papers that our brother F. M. Bruner is making a noble appeal for Apostolic Christianity among the good people of Monmouth, Ills. His efforts there are well suited also for other localities—and we shall present our readers with at least a part of his work in this behalf. We commend his clear and earnest efforts to all lovers of union upon Apostolic grounds.—W. K. P.]

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS IN MONMOUTH:—

I have learned from various sources that our position as a congregation of the professed followers of Christ is not understood by those around us. On one hand we are pronounced "not orthodox," and from another quarter it is declared that we deny the divinity of Christ. Both these statements are without foundation. And it is to correct these false and injurious impressions that I make, in behalf of my brethren and myself, and, as I sincerely hope the end will be, for the glory of God, the following statement and appeal:

1. A STATEMENT OF OUR AIMS AND POSITIONS.

The central thought and aim of the movement with which we stand connected, is *to come nearer to Christ*, by conforming the life of the individual and of the congregation to His will, as expressed in the testimony of His apostles.

We regard the proposition: Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, as a divinely authorized statement of the nature, personality and relations of the blessed Savior, and look upon every attempt, on the part of uninspired man, at a more philosophical statement of the same, as an impious attempt to improve what God has stated for us, and what Christ himself adopted as the foundation stone upon which he would erect his church. In this we recognize the principle: That where the Bible has given us a definition, there controversy should end. The whole of the controversy about the divinity of Christ has its origin in a presumptuous *attempt to define God's definition.* And this presumption has not stopped here. Many of the regulations and ordidances of the church have been defined out of meaning and importance. We believe, love and worship Christ in Bible presen-

Digitized by Google

tations of him, and if this is to *deny his divinity*, or incur the charge of "*not orthodox.*" we will willingly bear reproach for his name's sake.

From Him we derive our authority for making disciples, preaching, teaching and training the congregation. And all that he has taught us, by precept or example, we profess to do, to the disregard of everything *not to be learned from Him;* while we insist that fidelity to Him demands the observance of everything He commands us. Hence arise most of the differences between the rules and practices of our congregations and those of other religious bodies. We have dared to put away some things for which we found no *thus saith the Lord.* And we do not wait to inquire whether this is *orthodox* or not; *we know it is right.*

We regard Christ as now clothed with "all power in Heaven and on earth," and it is in obedience to this authority that we go forward to do the work He assigned His church. This work we find generically stated in the great commission given to his followers while yet with them.

We read it in Matt. xxviii. 18–20: And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.

Again, in Mark xvi. 15, 16: And he said unto them: Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.

And again, Luke xxiv. 46, 47: And he said to them: Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.

No great amount of scholarship is required (indeed it seems strange that great learning so frequently overlooks a matter so simple) to discover that this commission directs the preacher:

1st. What *he* shall do; 1, *Make disciples.* 2, Preach the gospel, repentance, remission of sins. 3, Baptize. 4, Teach.

2d. What he shall *require* of those to whom he preaches: 1, Be-

Digitized by Google

lieve. 2, Repent. 3, Be baptized. 4, Observe all things commanded by Christ.

Now we know of no rightful authority by which any of these duties laid upon either preacher or hearer by this commission have been repealed or rendered void. We endeavor therefore to follow strictly, the terms and spirit of our commission. We ask for no direction from Councils, Conferences, or Assemblies. Our duties are marked out for us, and in the name of the Great Head of the church, we proclaim and insist upon the observance of all that he has commanded; trusting God for his blessing in the pardon of our sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The deduction, then, is inevitable, that a ministry (I do not say minister, for some are educated and trained in a certain ministry as Saul was brought up a Pharisee) which ignores any of the terms of the commission Jesus gave his followers, or in any way seeks to disparage or change them, is an unfaithful ministry.

I have made the preceding statement without regard to man's opinion of it or fear of what he may say. I make it with the sad feeling in my heart that I do not, and, in many respects, cannot, act with those around me, who are engaged professedly in preaching the same gospel and its salvation to the people.

Why should this be so? And must it always continue? I think there is no one conviction deeper in the minds of thinking men than this: that the ultimate triumph of the gospel over the world is waiting for the reunion of all Christ's disciples. I say *reunion* for they were once united, and it is in that union that the Master prayed for them, and not out of it.

Thus united, they preached under the commission Jesus gave them, observing its terms themselves, and enforcing them upon others. And during that period results were accomplished that have ever since astonished the reader of history.

Dear friends in Christ, the Master loves his followers, and desires their triumph as much now as he did then. And what are we accomplishing in building up his kingdom? Where is his enemy discouraged? Yes! The rather is he not taking courage? Is the fault with Him or with us?

II. Appeal to the Friends of Christ.

My appeal to the friends of Christ in Monmouth is, then, th is That we, as one man, take up this commission given us by ou

Digitized by Google

Master again; and that we go back to Jerusalem, and begin with Peter and the rest, and follow their example in what we preach to the people and require of them. And my faith in Jesus tells me that he will lift up his people, and that he will clothe them with strength to gain similar triumphs in his name.

I claim nothing new for what I have said. I have humbly endeavored to direct attention to the "*old paths.*" And I put forth these statements well aware of my own humble place among my fellow citizens. You may feel that it is arrogant or presumptuous in me, but I answer that I am prompted by the deepest convictions that the thing is right and ought to be done. The insignificance of my own name, however, will not, I sincerely hope, detract from the worthiness and desirableness of the end in view.

"He who has my commandments, and keeps them, he it is who loves me."—*Jesus.*

F. M. BRUNER.

MONMOUTH, ILLS.

EDUCATION.

Among the greatest duties we owe to our children, is that of educating them. We fear there is a growing neglect of this duty, not perhaps intentional, but through a delusion as to what constitutes an education. The "common schools" are maintained at a common expense, and we naturally patronize that for which we pay. We are taxed to support these schools, and we send our children to them to get a return for our money. This is well, if we do not attach more value to these schools than belongs to them. But in too many cases, parents are content to limit the education of their children to the meager course of instruction which is furnished in these schools. They are not aware, that for real education—education in its true sense—the common school is practically impotent. They do not *educate* our children:—and, as the great majority of them are and must be officered and managed, we cannot hope that they ever will do so.

In the first place:—There is an almost universal want of qualification in the teachers. They, or the great majority of them, have themselves never been educated. They have the meagerest acquaintance with the subjects which they are required to teach; and besides this, as a general rule, have the poorest faculty for communicating the little that they know. They have no enthu-

Digitized by Google

siasm of nature, and can of course impart none. Dull themselves, they deaden into dullness the native powers of the children they are employed to instruct. Instead of awakening an interest in study, they but too often create an aversion for all application of the mind to books, which a life time cannot overcome. It is hard to do anything profitably, unless we can, in some way, be made to feel an interest in doing it. The first elements of school instruction are in their very nature repulsive to children. Arbitrary signs are ugly things to the young eye, and long and dreary sessions of confinement over such things, are very often but little better than a sort of prison life. There is no period of its earthly life, that the mind needs more the gentle and encouraging hand of a superior teacher. The teacher of the common school ought to be among the most gifted of men or women.—They have one of the most delicate and difficult tasks to perform. But few things in the whole course of education require more art and genius to do them well, than does the proper and efficient instruction of childhood.

Not only are the teachers in our common schools, as a general rule, totally unfit for the tasks which are laid upon them, but, in the second place, the course of instruction embraced in these schools is but of little efficacy to educate the mind. I do not mean to say that it is not useful and necessary—we cannot dispense with it—but it is only the *acquisition* of a little knowledge, with but small development of the faculties by which knowledge is not only acquired but produced. The higher ends of education are not reached in the common schools; and these are the development and invigoration of the mind itself. Very often the mind comes out of the common schools, with a little knowledge of a few simple things it is true, but feebler, and less thirsty for the sort of knowledge that schools are supposed to furnish, than when it went into them. Now the highest result of education is to quicken the faculties for acquiring, and strengthen the mind for creating knowledge. For all this the common school is utterly inefficient: first, because of the incompetency of the teacher; second, because the course of instruction embraced in them does not afford the kind and quality of exercise suited to this end.

Let not parents be deceived, then, and conclude, that because they have given their children the *advantages* of the common schools, they have therefore educated them. They have only

Digitized by Google

given them a clumsy knowledge of certain arts, useful, very useful indeed,—but the mind is still left with no interest in the application of these arts for higher purposes, and but little skill in using them, even should it desire to do so. We should not be content to stop so near the beginning. Education, to be valuable, must be prosecuted into ripeness. Training must be kept up, and under higher masters, until the mind is developed into maturity of habit and energy. The means for doing this are found in our colleges. There ought, indeed, to be an intermediate grade of schools, between the primary common school and the college. In some districts these are provided, and we trust the provision will, in the course of no great time, become general. We need "High Schools" of a grade to fit young men for college; but to call a school a "High School," and to make it truly so, are very different things. We cannot have a "High School" without a class of teachers, which can rarely be procured for such places; and except in the large cities, it is next to impracticable to have them at all. But a large city is the last place to which a parent who is wise, will send his child, for the purposes of "High School" education. Apart from the greater expense of living, &c., in cities, there is the awful prospect of moral contamination, which experience proves but few ever escape; and these objections put a bar between such facilities and the great majority of our children, which but few ever do or ought to surmount.

The result is, that most young men have to pass from the common school to the college, with but little if any additional preparation. If they get such at all, it is generally through private teachers, and but very poorly imparted. In this respect we have made much better provision for our daughters than for our sons. The country is much better supplied with Seminaries for girls, than for boys; and it is a noticeable fact, growing, too, daily more and more conspicuous, that we are becoming much more concerned about the education of our daughters, than of our sons. Many a man will strain every nerve to send his daughter off to a "Boarding School," who will keep his son in stolid ignorance on the farm, in the shop, behind the counter, or in some other place where he can get money out of him. This ought not to be so.—If not corrected, it will tell a fearful story on the generations who shall come after us. We shall not enlarge upon this at present,—but hope the allusion may excite others to reflect upon it.

Digitized by Google

Our colleges must meet the practical wants of the age, and hence they are compelled, in good measure, to supply the want created by the neglect in our system of education to provide for an intermediate grade of education, which properly belongs to the "High School" or classical academy. Nearly all our colleges have found it necessary to provide for at least a partial course of primary instruction. Doubtless this is a disadvantage to the college. It brings together in some instances, classes of such disparity in age, that it is difficult to adjust the discipline so as to suit all equally well. Very young boys cannot be safely committed to the *liberties* of college discipline. They need to be more closely under the eye of the Teachers, and require, in many instances, other influences to induce them to study than those which are usually adopted in colleges. Or, if the discipline is adjusted to suit the younger students of a college, then it will not be adapted to the older members. The manliness and self-reliance, which are important elements in college education, will be sacrificed to the necessities of academy discipline. This double element in the college classes of the day, is a great annoyance to teachers, and a constant source of degradation in the college standards. But in so "fast" an age as this, we can see but little hope of getting rid of it. As things are, and as they are likely to be for a long time to come, the college is the only grade of school in which any of the higher advantages of education can be procured.

The question recurs, then, How many of us give our sons the advantage of a college education? Is not the number very small? And are we not, as a people, with all our boasted "Free Schools," really neglecting the education especially of our boys? We throw them out into the world, in which the widest fields of usefulness in literature, science and art are opening up before them, without one preliminary step in preparation, by which they may be enabled to enter them. We shut them out from a fair chance to use their *minds* to advantage, and compel them to seek for occupation in pursuits which require no education, and in which, of course, there are the fewest chances of success. Universally, educated labor is better remunerated than uneducated labor. A business which requires no previous study and training to conduct it, must always afford a less rate of compensation than one requiring skill and education;—therefore, looking at the question in a simply

Digitized by Google

economical point of view, it is evident that we can bestow upon our sons no surer means of success in life, than to give them an education which will fit them for *all* kinds of work, and thus open up to them the widest fields of employment and enterprise. The interests of the State—the interests of the church—literature, science, and art,—all demand of us, that we should educate our children and fit them for labor in all these fields; and it is fortunate, that what is the interest of all these, is also the interest of those who labor in them. We owe it to ourselves, to the public, and to our children, that their education shall not be neglected. Our best investment for our children and for posterity is that which we make in their thorough and complete education.

W. K. P.

FROM AUSTRALIA.—A COLLEGE FOR PREACHERS.

We make the following extract from a letter to Sister Campbell from our excellent Bro. Magarey, whose liberality to the missionary cause and to Bethany College, are known to many of the brethren in America. We trust the appeal of our Australian brethren to their brethren in America, will not be in vain. We know no nobler men than Bro. Magarey, and feel assured that their enterprise, as set forth in his letter, will be in the hands of true men.

C. L. L.

"My son Alexander and H. S. Earl are to sail from Sydney on the 20th Jan. for California, in the ship "Guiding Star." From thence, by the Pacific Railway, they will, D. V., visit the States. I have charged my son to visit Bethany, and to pay those respects to the loved ones there which I would have paid personally, had not the path of duty otherwise pointed out.

"We have now had three successive failures in harvest, which, added to other causes, has produced much distress, and has quite prevented us from raising money towards the proposed Bible College for Australia. Our American brethren here are sanguine that the brethren in America will assist us in this very desirable and necessary work. Bro. Earl has good hopes that he will be able to do something by bringing the matter before them. I am not sanguine, yet would hope for the best. One thing is certain: the cause of Christ, to be properly sustained here, must be sus-

Digitized by Google

tained by Australians who have made the Bible their prayerful study. We cannot expect to find the number of brethren in America willing to come here that would be necessary for so great a work. We must do it ourselves, with such assistance as the American brethren can spare us; and relying upon the promised blessing to those who in faith wait upon the Lord, we hope to succeed. May the Lord enable us all to be faithful, and preserve us to the great day of our deliverance.—Yours in the blissful hope, THOS. MAGAREY."

JOHN THE BELOVED.

A SONNET, BY JAMES CHALLEN.

"He surnamed them Boanerges—the sons of thunder."

Jesus the Christ, whose searching eyes
See all that dwells within the breast;
Who knows the latent power that lies
Within the human heart, at rest.
The strength of will, that love can wield,
The mastery of its tearful eye;
Its conquests in each battle-field,
Its ardors kindled in the sky;
Its power to shake the heavens and earth,
Its matchless energy and fame,
Its heavenly origin and birth,
The grandeur of its living flame;—
And thinking thus, I cease to wonder,
That John is called—"A Son of Thunder."

DAVENPORT, Iowa.

While the Italian Kingdom, with a population of 24,000,000, is represented in the Ecumenical Council by 133 members, and the Papal States, with a population of 3,000,000, by 143, France is represented by only 84 members, Austria by 48, the German Confederation by 19, Great Britain by 35, and the United States by 48. The Italian members of the Council, in fact, form considerably more than a third of the whole.

Digitized by Google

WHAT IS SECTARIANISM?

We have been thinking much on this question of late, and now ask it, not in curiosity, but with a sincere desire to call the earnest and prayerful attention of our most experienced and influential scribes to its considerate answer. Of course I do not wish for a general definition of the word, but a real life-like picture of the thing, as it exists in the present day. It is charged by many that we are a sect. Is this so? If not, are there any sectarians holding prominent or respresentative position among us? I shall be be particularly gratified to have the finest discrimination of the *Review*, *Standard*, and *Apostolic Times* directed to the answer of this question. I am sure it will be gratifying to many readers,—profitable it must be to all. Let the question be seriously and prayerfully considered and treated. It is the greatest question, practically, of the day. All earnest men nearly are dehorting against sectarianism. Can it be possible that they do not understand themselves? It is thought to be the present great barrier to Christian union. What can be more important than that it shall be clearly and fully comprehended?

I believe we are all honestly against the thing in name,—I am not so sure that we are equally against it in fact. Let us understand ourselves, and seek also to enlighten our neighbors.

W. K. P.

LIPPINCOTT'S MAGAZINE for April, with three full-page Illustions. Contents: I. The Vicar of Bullhampton—Part X—by Anthony Trollope. II. Frosted Windows: (Poem). III. The Negro in the South—by E. A. Pollard. IV. Two Old Heads—by Grace Greenwood. V. Leonard Heath's Fortune—by Mrs. R. H. Davis. VI. Our Credit Abroad. VII. Florida. VIII. Luck in a Shadow. IX. The Washington Season. X. A Real Hero. XI. About Hogs. XII. The Sailor's Wedding (Poem). XIII. How I became a Pagan. XIV. Noah Webster—by L. Gaylord Clarke. XV. A Six Day's Diary. XVI. Our Monthly Gossip. XVII. Literature of the Day.

Anthony Trollope's new story, *Sir Harry Hotspur of Humblethwaite*, will commence in the May number. Terms—Yearly subscription, $4. Single number, 35 cts. Philadelphia, Pa.

Digitized by Google

THE SEMI-ANNUAL CONVENTION

Will assemble in Allegheny City, Pa., May 17th, 10 A. M. We expect this to be one of the happiest meetings of the kind we have ever held. All interested in the objects of the Convention are cordially invited to attend.

A written report will also be presented showing the progress made in organizing on the Louisville plan.

THOMAS MUNNELL, *Cor. Sec.*

THE W. V. MISSIONARY CONVENTION.

The brethren in West Virginia will remember the State Meeting, which is to be held in Wheeling on the 10th of May next.—Bro. Thomas Munnell is expected to be present, to assist in organizing the State on the Louisville plan. A large attendance of the brethren of the State is earnestly desired. Brethren from the adjoining States are cordially invited to be present.

Good Words from Our Correspondents.

WORCESTER, MASS., FEB. 21, 1870.

BRO. PENDLETON:— * * * We are in a little home meeting here now. Eleven have been added to this date. Fraternally,

ALANSON WILCOX.

SNOWVILLE, Va., April 1st, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I returned home about a week since from a tour of ten weeks into East Tennesse. Made the acquaintance of many noble-hearted brethren and sisters, and though the weather was quite unfavorable, had good meetings. My winter campaign closes with about 100 additions. To God and the Word of His grace, be all the glory. Yours fraternally, G. W. ABELL.

VANCEVILLE, Pa., March 14, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I have just returned from Bruceton, W. Va., where I delivered twelve discourses. The Lord added eleven to the church—nine young men and two young ladies. I have seldom, if ever seen a more intense interest; and had the meeting continued a week or two longer, I doubt not that many more would have been left

Digitized by Google

rejoicing in the Lord. I enjoyed the co-operation of Bro. L. W. Scott, resident minister. He is worthy of all confidence and a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. I spoke once in California as I passed by, and immersed one young man. This makes 41 added to the church in the last named place since October.

Truly yours O. G. HERTZOG.

ALBA, Bradford co., Pa., March 28, 1870

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I have held a meeting at Canton, which resulted in five confessions and immersions, four wanderers reclaimed, and four united who had been immersed—twelve in all. The result of a meeting at Alba, which closed a few days ago is as follows: nineteen confessions and immersions; two from the Free-will Baptists, one from the Methodists, and one who had been immersed by one of our brethren; two wanderers restored,—twenty-five in all at Alba. Thirty-seven at both places. To the Lord be all the praise.

I expect, the Lord willing, to commence a meeting of some days at Leroy, eight miles distant, and hope to have good news to report. Those reported are at my regular preaching points.

Bro. L. P. Streator, from the western part of this State, made us a visit and preached three very excellent discourses. The result of Bro. Streator's meeting at Granville Center, Pa., was fifteen confessions and immersions, 13 of whom were immersed by Bro. Streator, and two by myself. Bro. Streator being suddenly called away on account of sickness at home, I went to continue the meeting. Stopped over two evenings, when I was suddenly called home by sickness in my family, which was very unfortunate for the meeting. Bro. Spencer continued the meeting over Lord's day.

My brother, who is here on a visit from the east, has been very successful in the proclamation of the Gospel of Christ at Covington, Tioga co., Pa. He has had over 40 additions to the cause there. My Christian regards to Bro. Allen and son. Tell him the Harbinger and Campbell on Baptism came to hand all safe.

Yours in the hope of eternal life, ALEXANDER GREENLAW.

OBITUARIES.

Died, at his residence in the county of Henrico, Va., on the 24th of Feb. last, Dr. F. W. POWER, late of Yorktown, Va., in the 51st year of his age.

Thus has perished from this earth one of nature's noblemen—a man literally "without reproach" in all the relations of life. As husband, father, friend,

Digitized by Google

and citizen, he exhibited in one glow of associated beauty the finest model of the man, harmoniously blended with the purest type of the Christian.

In the flush and vigor of early manhood, he "put on Christ" in baptism, and during an eventful period of nearly thirty years, the beauty and the power of the religion of his Lord and Master shone forth so brightly in his daily walk and conversation as to demand recognition from all; and he may truly be said to have attained that highest round in the scale of Christian perfection—"He visited the fatherless and the widow in their affliction, and kept himself unspotted from the world."

He was never "ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," but under all circumstances it was his proudest ambition to be known as a "Disciple;" while in the practice of his noble profession, beside the couch of suffering, he was pre-eminently a "ministering angel."

In the lower Peninsula, of which he was a native, and for twenty years a practising physician, the name of "Fred. Power" is a household word, which a loving tradition will not willingly let die.

He fell "asleep in Christ" with a full knowledge of his near approach to the realms of darknsss, sustained by an unwavering faith, oft repeated in his last illness, in Him whom he had served and trusted. In brief,

> "He *lived* as mothers would have their sons to live;
> He *died* as fathers would have their sons to die."

To the bereaved widow and orphans, he left the priceless legacy of an untarnished name; and though tears of grief must flow for the loss of such a husband and father, yet it should be mitigated by the firm conviction that their loss is his gain—the gain of victorious palms and an immortal crown. C.

RICHMOND, March, 1870.

Died, at Wellsburg, W. V., on the 17th of March, Bro. JOHN CARLE, a member and elder of the Christian church in Wellsburg.

Bro. Carle was born in Fayette county, Pa., near Brownsville, and removed to Jefferson co., Ohio, in 1805, and to Wellsburg in 1811, where he has ever since lived. Here, on the 29th of November, 1829, he, together with his wife and his brother Joshua Carle, was immersed by Walter Scott, who said on the occasion, "The persons who on this day obey their Lord, will, in after years, look back with joy to this day,—the day of their new birth."

Bro. Carle's life was one worthy the profession he made. He was a brave, pure and noble spirit, loving and kind, gentle and peaceful, and loved and esteemed of all. With unwavering fidelity and joy he held fast to his faith in Christ. The church of God was his home and his delight. The immense concourse that attended his funeral testified to the general appreciation in which he was held by all that knew him. Our brother reached an advanced old age, and died in the bosom of an affectionate family, to whom this loss will be irreparable. C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. Va.

CAMPBELL & McDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin. 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Bindin	25	Extra Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edges - - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, - -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. Va.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., MAY, 1870. [No. V.

BAPTIZO IN THE HELLENISTIC, OR NEW TESTAMENT DIALECT.

In the controversy about the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, it has often occurred, and doubtless will yet often occur, that the advocates of pouring and sprinkling, when driven from their ground by the obvious and invariable classic meaning of *baptizo*,—to immerse, have recourse, as a last resort, to the plea that as the Greek language passed, from the classic to the Hellenistic dialect, through changes which affected the meaning of words,—the signification of a word in classic Greek is no rule for its signification in the Hellenistic dialect of the New Testament period; and that, furthermore, this dialect as represented in the New Testament, has there again peculiarities of its own, still further affecting the meaning of words, so that classic usage is still less a law for the New Testament Greek. Over and over again, with a show of learning often, are the changes rung on this argument, and that especially before audiences altogether incompetent to judge of the truth or falsity of the facts adduced.

There is in this argument based on the peculiarities of the Hellenistic and New Testament dialect, a very disingenuous and shallow sophistry. First, with much show of learning,—quite cheap, the historic fact is exhibited, in exaggerated form, that the Greek language, from the classic to the Hellenistic period, did pass, in its written and spoken forms, through lexical and

Digitized by Google

grammatical changes. It is then shown that these changes are found in the New Testament Greek, with certain peculiarities of its own. Then under cover of these facts, that in their proper, true bounds nobody denies, a general mist is thrown over the meaning of words, and so *baptizo* is rescued, for the peculiar benefit of pedobaptists, from its proper, classic meaning. This is sophistry;—the legitimate course on the part of the pedobaptist, should be, to show that the changes from classic to Hellenistic Greek affected *baptizo* at all—for it was only within certain limits that the meaning of words was affected; and then it is further incumbent on him to show, that this influence on *baptizo* was so great as to change it from its primary, exclusive meaning,—to *immerse*, so as to comprehend also to *pour* and to *sprinkle*, or the latter two only, to the entire abandonment of its original signification.

We propose in a brief and direct way, to look at this question. And first, a few words in general, on the New Testament diction.

In the time of Alexander the Great and his successors, in consequence of their wars, by the general mingling together of all parts of the Greek-speaking peoples, and also the general considerable decline of Greek classic literature, in the place of the pure Attic which had become the predominant form of classic Greek, a general, popular language was gradually formed, of a lower type, constituted of a melting together, so to speak, of the various hitherto separately existing dialects, which contained in it that which was common to all these dialects, as well as elements peculiar to each. This *common* or *Hellenistic dialect*, in its best form, of course, was *the language as written*, in its lower form, the *language as spoken*. As such, in both forms, it became the speech of the peoples lying around the eastern part of the Mediterranean; the medium of common intercourse among these, it was the effect of the dominion of the Macedonian conquerors over these nations. In addition to this *common* or *Hellenic* speech, each particular nation also, mingled with it, naturally, when it spoke it, something of the words and forms of speech, of its own native language. So in Syria, the Syriac, in Palestine, the Aramaic or Hebrew of that day, in Egypt, the Coptic, would, to some extent, give *coloring* to the common Greek speech. This Aramaic or late-Hebrew coloring in the New Testament diction, is clearly defined and is well understood.

Digitized by Google

There have been two extremes with reference to the New Testament Greek;—some supposing thereby to vindicate its Divine origin, claimed for it pure classicity; others, degrading it to the lowest level of barbarous Greek.

Both are entirely untrue. The New Testament offers no great difficulties to the Greek scholar, and the numerous Grammars of the New Testament Greek have long since thoroughly explored this field and made everything in it clear; so that we know to the smallest niceties in what respects and how far it differs from the Classic Greek, and what influence the national speech and the religion of the Jews had upon it.—After these general observations, we come directly to the matter before us.

The question then is, what is the meaning in the Hellenistic and New Testament Greek of the word *baptizo* and its derivative nouns?

And first,—do the authoritative grammars on the New Testament diction enumerate this word as among those that have suffered a radical or essential change from their former classic use? We have before us several of these grammars, and not one so presents this word. Winer's large, exhaustive work, that points out and treats of all the lexical and grammatical peculiarities of the New Testament Greek, specifying every word and expression, even to the smallest particles, that are in any way affected by the peculiarities of the New Testament diction, knows nothing of any such change in baptizo and its derivatives, as this pedobaptist argument on the peculiarities of the New Testament Greek insists on. In Trollope's full and admirable critical Greek Grammar,* covering precisely the field of this argument, there is not a single intimation concerning any change in *baptizo*, as to the action indicated by it. There is indeed reference to this word.—In speaking of the preposition εἰς, he quotes Mark i. 9, as follows: "ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, *he was baptized* by immersion *in the Jordan*." (p. 175). Such is the knowledge of this eminent scholar and clergyman of the church of England, as to the meaning of this word 'in the New Testament and Hellenic dialect'!

* "A Greek Grammar to the New Testament and to the Common or Hellenic Diction of the later Greek Writers, &c.," by the Rev. Wm. Trollope, M. A., of Pembroke College, Cambridge; and formerly Classical Master of Christ's Hospital, London.

Digitized by Google

So much for Grammars of the New Testament diction. We shall cite New Testament Lexicons before we conclude this article. We shall now refer to the most direct class of evidence in this case,—writers in the Hellenic dialect, whose testimony must be conclusive. And we shall first select those more immediately connected with the New Testament.

The writers that most closely represent the Greek as found in the New Testament are the translators of the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament,—commonly called the *Septuagint*, the authors of the apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments, Josephus, and Philo the Alexandrian Jew, the later Greek versions of the Old Testament, and the Christian fathers who wrote Greek. After these come the other writers who wrote in the Hellenic dialect.

We first cite the *Septuagint*. This is a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, made by Jews, and represents fully the Hebrew-Greek form of the *common* or *Hellenic speech*, as current among the Greek-speaking Jews in Palestine, in Alexandria, and other Greek cities. The Septuagint may be regarded as the mother, religiously, of the New Testament Greek. The testimony it offers, therefore, of the meaning of *baptizo* is decisive as to its meaning in the New Testament,—both using the same Greek diction. How, then, is this word used in the Septuagint?

It occurs first 2 Kings v. 14, "And Naaman went down and *baptized* himself seven times in the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God." The word in this passage as we have here indicated, is the word *baptizo;* does any one doubt its meaning here,—that it means to immerse? So the translators of our Common Version understood it,—for they render it "*dipped* himself," and so the whole English world reads it and has read it for over two centuries. It has always been understood so, and so translated by equivalent words in other tongues. The Latin Bible newly translated from the Hebrew and annotated by Tremellius and Junius, renders it '*immersit* se in Jordanem,' he immersed himself in Jordan. So also Pasor in his New Testament Lexicon under baptizo, 'immersit se Naaman in Iordane septies,' Naaman immersed himself seven times in the Jordan. The word in the Hebrew original is the verb *taval;* what is its meaning? Stockius in his Hebrew Dictionary defines it—'tinxit, intinxit, immersit, demersit, baptein, baptizein,'—to dip, dip in, immerse, submerge,

Digitized by Google

baptein, baptize. Gesenius defines it,—'to dip, dip in, to immerse,' and cites the case of Naaman as an example.

This is definite enough, surely, as to the meaning of the Hebrew word, represented in this passage by 'baptizo,'—*it never means anything but immerse, dip, or submerge.* The verb *baptizo* occurs again in the Septuagint, Isa. xxi. 4—ἀνομία με βαπτίζει—iniquity over-*whelms* me,* referring to the depths of terror and misery into which iniquity sinks. In his Lexicon to the New Testament Greek, under *baptizo*, Bretschneider, referring to the symbolical use of the word, says: "In a tropical sense, 'to be baptized with the baptism of any one'—as Math. xx. 22, &c., signifies to suffer what another suffers, *to be overwhelmed with that with which he is overwhelmed. iisdem obrui, quæ ille obruitur.* As also in Latin *submergo*, just like the Greek baptizo, in profane writers very often signifies *to be overwhelmed* with something, *to be immersed* in something, as Isa. xxi. 4, (quoting the very passage before us—L.), Josephus, Wars. 4, 3: 3, 'they baptized the city,'" &c., &c.—adding other examples. This tropical use of the word to denote to be overwhelmed with misfortune, is abundant. As David says: "All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me." Ps. 42: 7.

In the apocryphal books, the word occurs in Judith, ch. xii. 5-9—"and Judith went forth by night into the valley of Bethulia, and *baptized* herself in the camp at the fountain." With the meaning of *baptizo* as above fixed in the case of Naaman, who was told 'to wash' or bathe 'himself,'—and went out as ordered, to the Jordan to do it, and did it by dipping himself, according to the commandment of the man of God; and also with the well-known custom of the Jewish bathings before us, the case of Judith is clear,—that she bathed or immersed herself at this place. If her purpose had been merely to wash by *pouring*,—for sprinkling is of course out of the question,—surely to go this inconvenient distance by night to the fountain would not have been necessary, as she could with much greater comfort have done it in her tent where all necessary conveniences could have been had.

In the *Wisdom of Sirach*, commonly called *Ecclesiasticus*, ch. 34: 25, we have "*baptizing himself* from a dead body, and touching it again, what is he profitted by his bathing—τῷ λουτρῷ—? This

* Our Common version translates the Hebrew differently from the Septuagint, —'fearfulness affrighted me.'

Digitized by Google

denotes the *bathing of the body* to purify from contact with the dead, and is a washing, or bathing, like that of Naaman, which was likewise for purification. Bretschneider, in his Greek-Latin Lexicon for the New Testament, refers to these cases in his definition of *baptizo* as follows; "*baptizo*,—(frequentative of *bapto*), properly signifies, I dip often, I wash (or bathe) often; then I wash, I wash off, [or completely—L.] with the signification of the middle voice, I wash myself, I wash myself off [or completely—L.]; Mark vii. 4,—unless they wash themselves, Luke xi. 38; (2 Kings v. 14,—[the case of Naaman—L.] Judith xii. 7; Sirach xxxi. 25); I immerse into water; I submerge. In the New Testament it is only applied to the solemn and sacred submersion used by the Jews," &c., &c. This states the case clearly. Baptizo properly, as a frequentative of bapto, signifies frequent or full dipping in water—*hence, and with this sense,* to wash,—to perform ablution, &c.—as illustrated in the cases of Naaman, Judith, ablution from a dead body, &c.; so used relative to the sacred washings of the Jews in the N. Testament,—as ablutions by submersion. As is the case of Naaman, so are also the others.

So much for the meaning of baptizo in the Hellenic dialect as found in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha of the Jews. The conclusion in the next number. C. E. L.

LETTERS FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

LETTER VI.

ANASTASIS.

Dear Bro. Loos:—I have been reading a curious book, proceeding from your side of the big pool,—on which I desire to make a few remarks—*Anastasis*, by Professor George Bush. The work is written in a ponderous, lumbering, scholastic fashion, with a resolute avoidance of the Saxon part of our language, yet it reveals great mental force, and vast stores of learning. It is an elaborate attempt to vindicate and popularize the doctrine of Swedenborg. Besides serving as a sort of text-book for the "New Jerusalem Church," it has had pernicious influence far beyond such boundaries, being an arsenal from which heretics of all sorts seek their armor and their weapons.

I deem the question one of fundamental importance, for Resur-

Digitized by Google

rection from the dead, though found in all the Creeds, is practically ignored. During thirty years travel I have never heard a discourse on the subject, nor have I found in churches any earnest consecutive teaching of a pastoral kind looking in that direction. It is not difficult to account for this. The idea of glorified spirits in heaven, a matter quite unknown by New Testament writers, has got such a powerful hold on the religious mind, that the prime reality of "Jesus and the Resurrection" has gone off into the land of shadows. Indeed if there be fulness of glory for disembodied souls at God's right hand, of what importance is the Resurrection from the dead? The old tabernacles are of no use in the heavens, and may as well remain in the dust of the earth, or at the bottom of the sea.

Our author reasons that our knowledge of Holy Scripture, like our knowledge of Nature, is progressive; that there is gradual development in slow and toilsome steps, and sometimes new discovery leading to momentous results.

I am not going to quarrel with this. The word of God, like its Author, is immutable, and has organic perfection from the beginning. We can no more add to it by human power, than we can add another pillar to the dark blue vault, another rock or mountain to the Alps or Andes, or another star to the Solar System.

But by the education of the ages in the training school of God, we can gather insight and comprehensiveness, and the great outlines of the King's country may stand before our eyes, in finer proportions and richer lustre. In the natural domain, a *fifth* quarter of the world turned up when we discovered Australia, and I presume that Bush imagined that in the moral world his "Anastasis" would be of equal importance. I confess it rather reminds me of the opening of that pit in the Apocalypse from which a great smoke arose to blacken the face of nature, and hide the upper luminaries.

I see many shapes in the smoke whose faces look sinister and revolting. One of them is found in the statement that our Lord proceeded on the principle of *accommodation*, that he spoke of resurrection in accordance with the sentiments and diction then prevalent. This kind of talk is a "sore evil" under the sun, for in the room of finding an unsullied Lord speaking with majestic force and transparent beauty, we find a man of subtle craft and

Digitized by Google

policy, a trimmer, trading on the superstitions of the people.—I cannot spend time in refuting this unworthy speculation, but can only say in the present stage, "Get thee behind me Satan." Another of the spectres appears in such passages as the following, of which we have many: "It is obvious beyond question that the popular theory reduces us to great extremities of solution. Indeed we see not but that the difficulties which cluster about it are insuperable; and if Faith has only this view of the Resurrection to present to Philosophy, we cannot perceive any ground for wonder that Philosophy should be slow to receive it, and yet Philosophy and Faith—like Righteousness and Peace in the economy of God—are and must be wedded together." I have as much regard as any living man for true science, and authentic Philosophy. Nature and man, its earthly lord, proceed from God as well as the word of Inspiration. The hand-writing of God is to be found in the fields of starry splendor, among the underworld rocks, and in the deep abysses of the human soul. And when any reverential interpreter speaks from the temple of the visible with his feet and his head uncovered, how charming it is to listen! But only think of the threatening notices to quit, which we Christian men get from age to age. From King Julian down to Baron Holbach, what strange assault and battery we have sustained in the house of supernaturalism. From Spinoza the Jew, down to Hume the Scotchman, what sepulchres have been built and painted for the burial of ourselves and our cause. Even now the men of Philosophy and Science cannot conceal their exultation when anything 'crops out' which looks hostile to the claims of the Son of God. Moses blundered the story of Creation, the unity of the race is a fable, witchcraft is a delusion, evil spirits a superstition, incarnation a myth, miracle an impossibility, man a development from the ape, and conscious immortality a falsehood.

I find the savans always hoping that some regal form may descend from the Constellations to dissipate supernaturalism, or that some dismal face may emerge from the underworld to give the lie to Christianity. Be it known to our benevolent friends that we have set our house in order, and when these dread messengers appear, we are prepared to give them suitable reception.

In the meantime, while waiting for this Ragnarock, or twilight of the gods, we are not in any special anxiety about the supposed discrepancies or antagonisms. Philosophies pass over the

Digitized by Google

stage like imposing phantoms, chasing each other into darkness. They shine in their little season like castles and towers in the western sky, as glorious and as transitory. And though Positive Science has some better foundations, yet hostile schools are continually rising. It is quite possible that some new discovery may scatter the old schools just as the telescope of Lord Rosse scattered the Nebular theory. As the Sun theory of Sir William Drummond, Dupuis, and Volney, and the Myth theory of Strauss and Renan vanished in the light of historical criticism, so the Nebular theory vanished when a powerful instrument penetrated space. The undeveloped systems, the sperm of young stars and growing worlds, were all cleared off. The professor says, "The resurrection of the body, if my reasonings and expositions are well founded, is not a doctrine of revelation." What do the documents say?

"Many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake."

"Many bodies of the saints which slept arose."

"All that are in their graves shall come forth."

"Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they awake."

"I will raise him up at the last day."

"I will bring you up out of your graves."

"The sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead."

These passages have the ring of reality about them; they certainly give no uncertain sound, and it does not surprise me, that when the professor began to expound them he got into "extremity of solution," which I take to be quagmire where the bottom is difficult to find.

In consideration of your limits, I will divide my reflections into other three letters, the next examining the difficulties from Reason,—the final two following him through the Old and New Testaments. In concluding the present letter, I may say that the professor gives no evidence in his portly volume of insight into the respective provinces of Philosophy and Supernaturalism. It is by Faith that we receive the underived existence, the eternity of the Almighty, the creation of matter, the Incarnation of the Word.

Is there any forgiveness for sins? If a man die, shall he live again? Science and Philosophy are possessed with dumb devils when we ask any questions of this character, and reason does little more than push great stones in the way of our heavenly Chariot.

G. GREENWELL.

Digitized by Google

THE DEACON'S OFFICE AGAIN.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—The Harbinger for March is at hand. Your reply has been carefully studied and duly appreciated. I have not the vanity to suppose myself capable of changing the position of the brotherhood on this important practical question.

All that I am anxious to accomplish is, to satisfy my own mind by calling out the best information obtainable on the subject.

You mistook my object in mentioning, that others and more capable than myself entertain views similar to mine, on the deacon's office. I do not suppose the weight of opinion is on my side; nor could I admit it a safe criterion to decide such a question if it were; neither am I willing to rest satisfied with such evidence alone, when the majority, as it is in this case, is largely against me. As a general rule, in all past time, majorities have been against the truth; but a plurality vote is not a safe criterion by which to decide matters of criticism. I only alluded to the fact that older brethren sustain said opinion, to remind you that I am not the author of it. You think that among the few who hold this opinion, "It will be hard to point out any names, that rank high among scholars on questions of this kind." That may be admitted, and yet not stand as a sufficient reason for closing the investigation. It occurs to me that religious scholarship, especially that found in high ecclesiastical places, has never been much inclined to advance to new positions. It has contested ground in reformatory movements of the past, which it has afterwards been compelled to yield, though such ground was surrendered by inches. May it not be that our scholarship is a little like that in some other religious organizations, inclined to defend to the best advantage the positions we have adopted, though they be not the clearest imaginable. If coming time shall show our present position to have been somewhat influenced by an Episcopalian translation, I shall not think it wonderful. My difficulty arises from this fact: that reading the Greek of the New Testament, without any ideas from modern Church establishments, I see no foundation for any such office in the church, as that which we call the deacon's office.

Your second paragraph relates to the transfer of deacon from the Jewish Synagogue to the Church of Christ. You admit, that

Digitized by Google

the transfer you claim was not made by any formal and explicit statute, but by process which you claim "is easily recognized and acknowledged." Is not this about the ground taken to sustain infant church-membership? Those who advocate it do not claim any formal and explicit statute for infant church membership, under the new covenant; but such membership having existed under the old covenant, it was transferred to the new, by a process easily recognized and acknowledged. I am not satisfied that even Elder was *transferred* to the church of Christ, as any part of the Synagogue worship; but, that it was adopted as one of the terms to be applied to the officers of the church, because it suited the genius of the new institution. Some items in the church being found similar to some in the synagogue, would hardly prove that those items had been *transferred* from the latter to the former. Notwithstanding circumcision was steadily pressed on the Apostles, by Jewish converts to Christianity, they would not admit it into the new system, though to have done so would probably have conciliated Jewish prejudice more than all other measures combined. But, if your remarks concerning the transfer of Elder be correct, I fail to find the evidence that the term deacon came into the Church in some way. Neither the English nor the Greek, of the New Testament, mentions any class of officers in the Jewish Language called deacons or diakanoi; and, as you have not informed me where I can find an account of them, I am still dissatisfied with your statement about the transfer of the title named. In Dr. Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, under the head, "Officers of the Synagogue," I find the following:—"The Chazzan, or minister of the Synagogue, (Luke iv: 20) had duties of a lower kind resembling those of the Christian deacon or subdeacon. He was to open the doors and get the building ready for service." But minister is not translated, in this passage, from diakonos; and Dr. Smith makes his duty more nearly correspond with that of our sexton than our deacon's duty.

You allow, that the word deacon has as many official meanings in English, as there are churches in which it is used as an official designation. You then ask: "Is it not also true of baptizo?"—Not specially so of baptizo, but preeminently true of baptize, the transfer of that word into English. Now I understand, that our brethren object to baptize as a representation of baptizo, for the same reason that I object to deacon as a representative of diako-

Digitized by Google

nos. Both are modern ecclesiastical terms, and contain a variety of meanings in English. Each of the original words, however, can be translated by an English word, which will give its exact meaning in Scriptural usage. Baptizo does not always refer to the Christian ordinance in its Bible use; yet, I am persuaded, that if I should contend for translating it by its simple meaning to dip or immerse, when it does not refer to the ordinance, and transfer it by the ecclesiastical term baptize where it does, I should be pronounced sectarian by some of our scribes. Do you not proceed on the same principle, when you contend that diakonos should be translated by its simple meaning minister, when not used officially, and transferred by the modern church title deacon, when used in an official sense? Elder is another word you instance, and as the modern ecclesiastical title Presbyter is a transfer of the original word presbuteros, why not contend, that when presbuteros is used in an unofficial sense it should be rendered by its simple meaning Elder; and when used in an official sense, it should be transferred Presbyter? We have it translated Elder, without distinction as to its official or unofficial usage, and have no difficulty in determining where it is used as an official title. I contend for the same principle in the translation of diakonos; reject modern church titles of diverse meanings, translate by its simple English representative, and let the context show when such word becomes an official term. I have not aimed to assert that diakonos never indicates an official position in the church; think it is so used frequently. Bishop should give place to overseer for the same reason that presbyter and deacon shold give place to elder and minister.

Your next two paragraphs relate to the meaning of diakonos in an official sense. Let us have no controversy over that, for I believe it as much as you do. We only differ as to the character indicated when it is so used. I think the Greek word diakonos is *sometimes* used as an official title in the church of Christ, that diakoneo indicates the service and diakonia the position or office of the same individual; but I do not believe the teaching of the Greek is fully carried out in the prevalent idea among us concerning the deacon,—his work and office. Your method of proving the correctness of the translation of diakoneo, in I Tim. iii. 10, 13, is to me, rather a novel one. You remark:—"The verb diakoneo is used in what grammarians call a 'pregnant sense,'—

Digitized by Google

To its primary and general meaning of to minister, there is added, by the force of its relation to the word deacon, used in its official sense, the idea of official use, and all thorough scholars, perhaps without respectable exception, and apart from any theory on the subject so understand it." So much the worse, I contend, for this array of impartial scholars, if they presume to translate one of the simple words of the Holy Spirit by a pompous circumlocution. If the simple diakoneo gives us the mind of the Spirit in the original, and ministro is a correct translation into Latin, then to minister will give us a perfect translation into English. Suppose it has a fullness of meaning not foundlin the word usually, will not the context show it in English as well as in Greek or Latin? If this 'pregnant sense' of the grammarians requires a circumlocution to give us the meaning of a simple word, the Holy Spirit would have done so in the Greek; but, not having made any distinction, it occurs to me that no such difference should be made in English. Those Lexicons excepted whose secondary definitions depend on modern translations of the New Testament, I find no lexical authority for such translations of diakoneo as, "Let them exercise the office of deacon." If this be a correct commentary or paraphrase, let it be used as such; but I do contend that it is no translation, since our simple verb to minister will fully represent the word the Holy Spirit used in Greek.

We agree in the fact that the individuals addressed in Phil. i. 1, in connection with the Overseers, were official characters.—But since you can tell nothing about the position they held except from the word translated deacons, and that word is so diversely used in the New Testament, no conclusion can be drawn from this passage affecting the difference between us. What is our difference? We agree that diakonos is *sometimes* used to indicate a permanent office in the church of Christ. You contend that when so used it indicates an Almoner, or one who has charge of the temporal interests of the church. I contend that the term thus used is another designation for evangelist or preacher of the Gospel. Let me now present you the reasons for my conclusions.

1st. A class of persons under Paul's direction, who went hither and thither at his bidding, and who were evidently evangelists, are frequently styled diakonoi (deacons). This word, when used

Digitized by Google

as in the passage now to be quoted, cannot refer to private members but public functionaries, and hence according to your rule must be a term signifying office. I shall introduce but two passages: a number of others could be given. "But that ye also may know my affairs, and how I do, Tychicus, a beloved brother, and faithful minister (diakonos or deacon) in the Lord shall make known to you all things. Eph. vi. 21. In I Thess. iii. 2, Paul says: "I sent Timothy, our brother and minister of God, (diakonon tou Theou) and our fellow laborer in the Gospel of Christ, to establish you and comfort you concerning your faith." Now I presume diakonos, in these cases, is either a term to indicate a private individual or a public officer. If the latter, then between you and me it either indicates an official deacon, or it is a term like evangelist to indicate the preacher of the word. The latter position with me is evident.

2nd. Anything like a fair contextual interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. and iv. shows that diakonos is a designation for the preacher of the word. Here I am reminded that you ask me to look over the moral qualifications of your supposed official deacons in the passage now before me, and see if I did not mistake in suggesting that we find the qualifications of the evangelist better set forth here, than those of our deacons. There is not a charcteristic named here, which should not be found in the life of every Christian; and since the only difference, so far as moral or religious qualifications are concerned, between a private member and a church officer is, that what the former are recommended to possess the latter *must* have, I conclude that the description, so far as it goes, suits the preacher very well. Up to the 13th verse, I agree that the qualifications would suit either of the characters for which we are contending, about equally, but I do not see how men will "Purchase to themselves a good degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus," in doing the work imposed on the deacons among us. I have never found one yet who did attain to great boldness in the faith, though I am acquainted with many who do the duty imposed on them well. If you refer me to the seven in Acts 6th, I answer, they were full of the Holy Spirit at first. On the contrary not one has ever been known to me who ministers well,—or if you still contend for a translation to suit a 'pregnant sense,' *used the office of a minister* well, that did not advance to great boldness in the faith which

Digitized by Google

is in Christ Jesus. In the 6th verse of the 4th chapter Paul says to Timothy:—"If you put the brethren in remembrance of these things, you shall be a good minister (diakonos or deacon) of Jesus Christ," &c. When we remember that the division into chapters and verses is a modern invention, we see that this is in immediate connection with Paul's description of diakonoi of the 3rd chapter. Whether therefore, we can tell just what kind of officers the diakonoi named in connection with the overseers are or not, we know that Timothy is here called a diakonos (deacon), and also, that he was an evangelist at the same time. Now, if one diakonos indicating an officer in the church is an evangelist, or preacher of the Gospel, why are not all the diakonoi in the same connection, referring to church officials, evangelists also? If this conclusion is not legitimate, I would like to have a rule that will stand the test of criticism, for determining what persons, to whom diakonos is applied in the New Testament, are official deacons.

3rd. The work of the Evangelist is defined by diakonia (deaconship). To sustain this position, I will introduce the following:—"And he gave some, apostles: and some, prophets: and some evangelists: and some, pastors and teachers: for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, (eis ergon diakonias, for the work of the deaconship) for the edifying of the body of Christ." Eph. iv. 11, 12. Can anything be plainer than that Apostles and prophets were to perfect the saints, evangelists to do the work of the ministry (deaconship), while pastors and teachers were to edify the body of Christ? On this passage you comment as follows: "In the catalogue of officers given in Eph. iv. 11, 12, we could not expect to find deacons, because they were not essential to the ends for which these officers were given." Deacons not necessary to perform the work of the deaconship! Candidly then, I do not know for what purpose they would be necessary. Now the work of the ministry (deaconship) is one of the things to be done; and, unless the deacon is named for the performance of that work, I would expect the same official to appear under another title; and I hold he does so appear under the name evangelist. We have three titles for the elder in Greek; why not more than one for evangelist? Again you say:—"Equally unwarranted would it be to translate diakonia deaconship, when not used in especial reference to the office, or work of a deacon." Then I would like o have a rule by which to ascertain when diakonia is so used.

Digitized by Google

In your first paper on this subject, you said concerning the seven in Acts 6th, that although not called deacons, since they were solemnly set apart, and the work to which they were assigned was called diakonia (deaconship), we can then, without doubt, call them official deacons. If this rule is true my reasoning on Eph. 4th must be admitted. But if you contend, as you seem to do in in your second paper when commenting on 1 Tim. 3rd, that diakonos must appear in connection with diakonia and diakoneo, to make the former mean deaconship and the latter mean to perform the office of deacon, then you lose Acts 6th from the record of official deacons altogether. I do not wonder, that you would not be understood as holding the position that the Scriptures are very definite as to all the duties and privileges of the deacon.

You seem to think that I mistake in supposing that the account of ordaining Elders is very full, since we only find two passages on that subject. I did not mean that we have a great number of passages in which the ordination of Elders is mentioned, but that the number so set apart is quite large. If we had no other account of conversions than that in Acts 2nd, I would still consider it quite full, since there were three thousand who became Christians on that occasion. Acts xiv. 23, gives an account of the labors of Paul and Barnabas in quite a large region of country in Asia Minor, while Titus i. 5, gives Paul's instructions to Titus, on this subject, concerning his labors on an island said to contain one hundred cities. If the account of ordaining deacons had been as full as this, it would be more satisfactory to me than your conjectural solution, that the Apostles left the Elders to ordain them.

The quotations you make from Clement Romanus and Polycarp, do not seem to me to reach the point in dispute between us. I am not denying that there was a class of officers in the Apostolic church called diakonoi; and that is all these quotations prove. I think your authors prove too much for you, however, for they show that the deacons had equal authority with the E ders or Bishops. Now the pastoral epistles give such authority to evangelists, but I presume you do not believe our deacons possess it. Then if we should translate Clement Romanus as saying, "The Apostles appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be overseers and ministers, over such as should afterwards believe," what would you gain in the argument? You deny that ministry (diakonia), in 2d Tim iv. 5, is used in an official sense, because

Digitized by Google

the office is previously defined to be that of an evangelist. Do you think when Paul says in Rom. xi. 13, "Inasmuch as I am the Apostle of the Gentiles I magnify mine office" (diakonia), that Apostle of the Gentiles, meant one thing, and office or ministry meant another? Is it not clear that his being the Apostle of the Gentiles *was* his office or ministry? If so, is it not equally clear that the work of the evangelist was Timothy's ministry? And this being the case, are you sustained in saying that ministry here cannot be used in an official sense?

Our whole theory of official deacons depends on three passages, viz: Phil. 1st, 1 Tim. 3rd, and Acts 6th. That the persons addressed in Phil. 1st in connection with the Overseers, were official characters, is admitted; but that they held an office identical with that of our deacon's is an assumption. May we not suppose there were ministers of the Gospel residing in some of the congregations; and, if so, would they not perhaps be subjects of address in the Apostolic epistles? The word here rendered deacons means ministers, and no good reason can be given for using the former instead of the latter term. If you contend that diakonos must be used in connection with diakonia and diakoneo to give them official force, then you lose Acts 6th and can tell nothing whatever about the duties of your supposed official deacons; but, if you agree that one is made an official deacon by being solemnly set apart to a work which is called diakonia, then Timothy and Paul with all the evangelists were official deacons. Either one of these positions will spoil your theory, and yet it seems to me that you must choose between them. You have not furnished the proof that the seven spoken of in Acts 6th received, disbursed, or had anything to do with money, yet this is about the only point in which we can claim that our deacons are their successors. Your quotation from Acts 4th will not do since it speaks of transactions before the seven were appointed. It is not clear to me that the money spoken of in Acts xi. 29, 30. was put into the hands of the Elders that they might hand it over to the deacons. There are no deacons mentioned in the transaction. If 1 Tim. 3rd does not contain a description of the evangelist, then there is no list of the qualifications for this official in the New Testament.

I have not attempted these replies to your strictures because I supposed myself capable of carrying on a discussion with you. You are certainly as much my superior in all other respects as

Digitized by Google

you are in years. Please except my warmest thanks for the kindness you have always shown me. Believe me when I assure you that every sentence of the foregoing has been penned with a sincere desire to do justice to what you have written.

Your Brother in Christ,

NINEVEH, Ind., April 12, 1870. JOHN C. MILLER.

REPLY.

DEAR BRO. MILLER:—I have given your long article in full, that the view which you propound may be fairly seen. Excuse me, if I do not repeat reasons which I have already given that satisfy my mind of the correctness of the unbroken interpretation of the Scriptures on this subject, from the Apostolic times until the present day. What you quote from Dr. Smith's Dictionary about the chazzan has no relevancy to my argument, since the chazzan of the Synagogue was not the prototype of the Christian deacon. The almoner of the Synagogue and the chazzan were as different as our deacons and sextons are.

I think you will find it about as difficult to persuade the student of the Greek New Testament and of the history of Apostolic times, that there was no such office as Deacon, as Renan and his school will to prove that the narratives of the Evangelists are only mythical stories about Christ. It is an easy thing to cast doubts upon any subject. Dr. Whately has made a very plausible argument against the historical existence of Napoleon Bonaparte by this method. De Quincy, in like manner, has made out Judas Iscariot to be on the whole a very good and well meaning Apostle—and so, a little ingenuity and convenient assumption can make a very plausible show for either side of almost any question.

It may be very true, that the deacons of our church do not come up to the standard of the Scriptures—but the correction is not in doing away with them altogether, but in showing them their duties more perfectly. The Evangelist and the Deacon were never confounded in the primitive church, and though Apostles, Evangelists, Elders, and Deacons all *ministered*, just as Judge and jury *judge*, yet the office of deacon was never confounded with that of the other functionaries. The facts of church practice under the eye of the Apostles are the best explanation of the meaning of these terms, and in the conclusion reached through these we ought to rest. Any other course only perplexes the unstable, and in no way tends to edify the body. W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

OLD SLANDERS.

[In our last we gave an article from the pen of our brother F. M. Bruner, of Monmouth, Ills., on "Our Aims and Positions." It seems that this earnest and respectable exposition and appeal has excited the fears of "A Presbyterian," who one would in charity think has been indulging in a Rip Van Winkle Nap, and being thus suddenly waked up, begins to revive and to repeat the old and exploded slanders, which sectarian bitterness originated now more than forty years ago. Bro. Bruner has made a fine defense of the character and work of the illustrious man whose good name is thus so recklessly assailed by A Presbyterian, a part of which, extracted from the "Monmouth Atlas," we give below.—W. K. P.]

CHRISTIAN FRIENDS:—Having waited some time to hear further from "A Presbyterian," and nothing appearing, I learned upon inquiry that he expected his last to "be final on his part." And more recently I am assured by one of his friends that "*he has accomplished what he intended to do.*" I cannot feel so. And having been assured of access to the columns of the *Atlas* by its Editors, I shall, at my leisure, clear up some of the darkness thrown around the name and character of A. Campbell by our retreating friend. This will impose upon me, under the circumstances, much labor that properly belonged to him, and for which I asked him. And as the investigation of the several topics involves facts not generally known to the public,—facts, too, that are necessary to a just appreciation of the views and character of Mr. Campbell—I shall proceed deliberately and thoroughly enough to secure, at least, justice to his memory. And if at any time my friend feels that "the cause of truth and the interests of Christ's kingdom" demand his return to the defense of positions he has so recklessly taken, I assure him there will be no dismay, in the camp, at the onset. Indeed it would be a grateful task to me to help sift this matter to the bottom now.

We will notice first "the worst thing Alex. Campbell did:"—"He published a mutilated version of the New Testament, with the base and dishonest pretense that it was a reprint," and "in this manner he undertook to blot out of the New Testament some of its most fundamental doctrines." This involves three distinct charges: 1*st.*—*A. Campbell published a mutilated version of the New*

Digitized by Google

Testament; 2d.—He dishonestly pretended that it was a reprint; 3rd. —He undertook to blot out some of the most fundamental doctrines of the New Testament.

And it is proposed by "A Presbyterian," to suspend the support of these charges upon four specifications and his own unqualified assertion: that "whenever Mr. Campbell finds a passage in the New Testament that teaches any of these doctrines (of the Trinity, divinity of Christ and Holy Spirit) he either changes its meaning in translating it, or presumptuously blots it out." The four specifications are: Mark 9: 24; II Cor. 4: 10; II Tim. 4: 1; Math. 23: 8. In the first three *kurios* is omitted, in the last one *Christos.*

First let us see what the assertion of "A Presbyterian" is worth. He says "*whenever.*" One would naturally infer thence that there is no passage left in this version from which these doctrines could be inferred. Let us look at some of the principal texts from which these doctrines are derived *as they stand in "this mutilated version of the New Testament."* One of the most distinct recognitions of the Trinity is Matt. 28: 19—"All authority is given to me in Heaven and upon the earth; go convert all the nations, immersing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The formula: "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit," is not "blotted out" nor "expunged." Again Matt. 3: 16, "Jesus being immersed, no sooner arose out of the water than heaven was opened to him; and the Spirit of God appeared, descending like a dove, and lighting upon Him; while a voice from heaven proclaimed: "This is my Son, the beloved, in whom I delight."—Further quotations are unnecessary. He has neither "blotted out" nor "expunged" II Cor. 13: 14; John 1: 14, 18; 15: 26; Gal. 4: 6. And if you will turn to "the Confession of Faith," p. 25, you will find that these are all the texts relied upon in that document in support of the doctrine of the Trinity, except one: I John 5: 7; so that "A Presbyterian's" *assertion* is simply and unqualifiedly a *falsehood.* There is, however, such a thing as being *overtaken* in a fault, and I pray that the Lord may grant him repentance for this crime, unintentionally committed, I hope.

You will notice furthermore that the passages relied upon by "A Presbyterian" and those chosen by the Assembly are not the same in any single instance. *And did not a Presbyterian know, when he employed these four texts as proofs, that they do not teach, nor allude to, the "doctrine of the Trinity, divinity of Christ and of the Holy Spirit?"* If he did and still employed them he is guilty

Digitized by Google

of another crime that adds pedagogueism to falsehood. I believe that the General Assembly knew better what texts prove these doctrines than "A Presbyterian," and if he had had proper regard for truth and justice he would have looked into *his creed* at least to ascertain what texts are generally relied upon to prove these doctrines.

If, then, the texts cited as evidence of a design to "blot out the most fundamental doctrines of the New Testament" do not teach the doctrines of "the Trinity," etc., then they cannot be employed in support of the charge from the want of relevancy. It follows then as a matter of course that *there is no evidence* before us *that Alex. Campbell did intend* "to blot out the most fundamental doctrine of the New Testament." For "A Presbyterian," being a minister of the Presbyterian church, duly qualified and fitted for his work, called no doubt by an unmistakable token to that office, certainly feels the obligations and responsibilities of his position distinctly enough to prevent him from resorting to absolute trifling with the sacred things of religion, which would be the case had he employed arguments *knowing them to be entirely irrelevant.* We must be charitable enough, then, to believe that he has employed the best arguments he could find. And as I do not wish to be understood as charging him with *deliberately* lying, I challenge *the assertion* as false; and how "A Presbyterian" came to make it, I leave to that court that makes no mistakes in its verdicts.

But, again, since A. Campbell *has retained* all the texts relied upon by Presbyterians themselves as proving the *doctrines of the Trinity, and divinity of Christ, and the Holy Spirit* save one, it is proof positive, that he recognized these doctrines as entitled to a place in his version. And what can we say of a man who, without a cause, provocation, or injury to himself, or the cause of truth and interests of Christ's kingdom, has published to the world: "*This is that arch traitor in the camp of the Lord,* who, while pretending such holy reverence for the pure word of God, has laid his unholy hands upon it, to *make* (italics his) it teach his heresies."

2d. We have disposed of the *assertion* and have shown the texts specified to be irrelevant to the charge of *blotting out.* For the sake of convenience we will next attend to the charge: 1st—That he published a *mutilated* version.

You will observe that all the three charges are sustained by the same specifications; for after stating them he introduces what he *supposes to be evidence* with the words: "*for example.*" It will be

Digitized by Google

necessary for us to inform our friend that specifications *are no evidence.* Each specification must be shown to be well-founded *by evidence* and then it can be admitted as an element in the charge. And he ought to know that where one of the specifications fails from *a want of evidence* it will to a corresponding degree affect the charge. Alex. Campbell is charged in the most uncompromising terms with publishing a mutilated version of the New Testament. Our legitimate inquiry then in dealing with the argument of "A Presbyterian" is:—Are his specifications well founded?

But let us determine before entering upon this inquiry the question: *What is a mutilated version of the New Testament?* A mutilated version, without doubt, would be such a version as *impairs the original integrity* of the New Testament scripture. It is necessary to this integrity that the number of its books be retained, that nothing be added to its text, and nothing taken from it, and, especially, that the thoughts and ideas of the original be conveyed into the language of the version, correctly and truly. Every failure on the part of the translator to faithfully represent in his own language the thoughts and ideas of the original Greek, is, in so far, a mutilation, though it may not be intentionally such.

But the specifications of our retired friend have to do with "*blotting out, expunging, and omitting.*" So that if the version published by A. Campbell is a mutilation it will appear when the specifications are examined and *found to impair the integrity* of the original New Testament scriptures.

Now here is just where our friend "A Presbyterian" utterly fails again. He has not attempted to furnish the *evidence* necessary. Indeed this whole proceeding on his part reminds me of a malicious boy that throws a stone from behind a corner and then hunts a hole for concealment.

Now everybody knows that the New Testament in common use is a *translation* and not the *original.* If, then, the translators have made mistakes it is not a mutilation of the New Testament to *correct these mistakes,* and publish a corrected version. But there seems to be something wrong with my friend's head on this point, for he accuses me of great impiety in an attempt to improve Mark 16:16. All who are acquainted with our language know that that passage contains one Greek word anglicized. And I had shown from his own authorities and from the scriptures that the word baptize in the *primitive times* meant to *immerse.*—This he did not question. If, then, the word *baptized* means *im-*

Digitized by Google

mersed, do I or any one else, mutilate the scriptures by saying so? On the other hand would we not mutilate them by covering up the meaning in a transfer of the original Greek word, as has been done. But honestly, now, good brother, did you never quote this passage: "He that believeth . . . shall be saved"? If you have not, I know those who have, and it is upon such preachers and teachers that we may with good reason charge the mutilation of God's word.

A careful investigation of this matter, then, leads me to this conclusion: *That what Alex. Campbell has done in the passages complained of is sustained by the most eminent scholars and translators of this country and Europe.*

Notice, however, before their authority is introduced, the carefulness and truthfulness of another *assertion*: "In such passages as Mark 9: 24; II Cor. 4: 10; II Tim. 4: 1; when the Greek word *kurios* (referring to Christ) occurs, he expunges it." From which we are left to infer that this is done without exception. But read Rom. 13: 14, "But put on the Lord Jesus Christ," and then continue reading the next chapter (for there is no lack of illustrations) beginning with the 4th verse: "Who are you that condemn another man's servant? By his own master (kurioo) he stands or falls; and he shall be made to stand, for God is able to make him stand. * * * He who observes the day, observes it to the Lord (kurioo); and he who does not observe the day to the Lord, does not observe it; he who eats, eats to the Lord, (kurioo) for he gives God thanks; and he who eats not to the Lord (kurioo) eats not, and gives God thanks. For none of us lives to himself, and none of us dies to himself. But whether we live, we live to the Lord (kurioo); and whether we die, we die to the Lord (kurioo). Whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's (kuriou). For to this end Christ (Christos) both died and rose, and lives again that he might rule over (kurieusoa), both the dead and the living."

My space will not allow me to introduce other passages which I find on every turning of the pages of the book. If it was his purpose to *blot out*, as charged, how could he have left *this* passage standing? This *assertion* then, likewise, indicates an utter want of acquaintance with the book, or a disregard of the facts in the case.

One thing might have helped our friend and prevented him from making so many blunders, if he had known that the leading ideas of the word *kurioes* is *ruling*. Hence, in the passage given above from Rom. 14; in the 4th verse it is translated *master* and

Digitized by Google

in the last verse it is seen as the *root* of the verb, and signifies "to rule over," or "be Lord." Hence Mr. Campbell has frequently translated it "Master," where it is evident that it was employed as a term of civility, but never (so far as I have had time to ascertain) as embracing the divine idea of Christ.

So much for the statement of another general, and, generally lame, proposition. We will now attend to the particulars upon which it was based:

1st—Tischendorf's Greek text omits *Kurios* and *Christos* in the passages specified (Mark 9: 24; II Cor. 4: 10; II Tim. 4: 1; Matt. 23: 8,) as Mr. Campbell does.

2nd—Griesbach (Greenfield's edition) (Mark, II Cor., and II Tim.), Kurios: a reading rejected as spurious, (Math.) Christos: the same.

3d—Conybeare & Howson (have translated only the Epistles of Paul) omit Lord in II Cor. 4: 10 and II Tim. 4: 1.

4th—DeWette (German translation) scores both these words as wanting authority in all these passages.

5th—An elegant translation in French agrees with Mr. Campbell in every particular.

6th—The American Bible Union Revision also sustains him.

7th—Stier, author of the Discourses of Christ, says to Math. 23: 8, "*ho Christos*" is to be erased, for the Lord would certainly not have used an unnecessary repetition in referring to himself.

8th—Lange remarks on the same passage:—*Ho Christos* is an addition from verse 10 and omitted in the Critical editions; on Mark he says, "*Kurie* is very doubtful. Meyer rejects it."

9th—Hodge (I have not the book before me), but he remarks on II Cor. 4: 10, in substance, that the omission of Lord brings the classes nearer together; implying clearly that it is an advantage to omit it. I take him to be the same who has also written a commentary on the W. M. Conf.

It appears, then, in the estimation of all these divines, critics, and scholars, that Mr. Campbell has committed no impropriety in omitting these words in these passages. In their judgment the integrity of the original is *not impaired*, hence *not mutilated*. And if these passages do not make out the case of a mutilated version, then we have no evidence that the version published by A. Campbell is a mutilated version. "A Presbyterian" having furnished his best evidence, I think that I can feel confident of this conclusion, for the men whose names I have cited are giants in learning, and I may say faith also. They are not small men like myself and "A Presbyterian," for we could sit on their shoulders as conveniently as grasshoppers.

Digitized by Google

I would now recommend to the careful consideration of "A Presbyterian," a paragraph or two of Whately's Logic on "The assumption of premises," page 258, especially to this remark:—"But it is worth remarking, that in all cases alike, of reasoning from induction, the greater or less degree of confidence we feel is always proportioned to the belief of our having more or less completely *ascertained all the circumstances* (italics W's) that bear upon the question." Did "A Presbyterian" ascertain all the circumstances before he published to the world that Mr. Campbell presumptuously blotted out the doctrine of the Trinity, divinity of Christ and Holy Spirit *whenever* he found a passage teaching it? If he did, then in the light of the evidence just presented, everybody must decide that he has deliberately published a falsehood knowing it to be such. But if he did not, (and I sincerely wish that this may be the case) then without knowing what he he was doing he has been exceedingly mad against A. Campbell.

Could the students of our college spend a few minutes to better account while studying Logic than to pick to pieces this sophism, which by "A Presbyterian" was intended to rob a great scholar of his reputation; a faithful servant of the Master, whom he loved, of his character; and the hero of many a conflict with error, of his well-earned laurels. We have seen, however, how these shafts, evidently poisoned in malice, fall harmless to the ground, and leave Mr. Campbell untouched, the peer of the most learned men of his age.

I feel, then, the utmost confidence in claiming that charges 1st and 3d have been fairly and honorably met, and will now direct attention to the use "A Presbyterian" or some one else (most likely the latter) makes of the title page of Alex. Campbell's version of the New Testament scriptures as translated by Geo. Campbell, Jas. McKnight, and Philip Doddridge. Here is the full title as found in the 3rd, 4th and 6th editions of this work: "The sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, commonly styled the New Testament. Translated from the original Greek, by Doctors George Campbell, James McKnight, and Philip Doddridge. With prefaces, various emendations, and an appendix—by Alexander Campbell, stereotyped from the third edition, revised 1833." The only difference between this and the title-page of the two previous editions seems to be this: The two first contained the words, "Doctors of the Church of Scotland," referring to the translators, and the later editions omit them because one of the translators (Doddridge) was a member of the Congregational church of England.

Digitized by Google

You will notice that this title page claims "various emendations" for the version. Mr. Campbell did not pretend to conceal the fact, then, that he had "amended" the work of George Campbell, Jas. McKnight, and Philip Doddridge. He publishes it to the world.

But what does "A Presbyterian" say? "He once published a version of the New Testament under this title: "The sacred writings of the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ, (he did not omit this word in his title page even) commonly styled the New Testament; Translated from the original Greek, by Geo. Campbell, Jas. McKnight, and Philip Doddridge, Doctors of the church of Scotland." *Omitting* the declaration of emendation, etc.

I leave it to you, my neighbors, to decide who has done the mutilating, and to find where "the base and dishonest pretense" belongs.

Now before I can be convinced that there is one spark of the Spirit of Christ in those who combined together to malign the character of a good and great man; to crush and discourage a weak and struggling congregation of those who love the Lord, by misrepresentation concerning their views; I shall expect to see all these unfounded and unprovoked charges recalled as publicly, as they have been put forth.—"*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.*"

With the indulgence and courtesy of our Editors, I shall now let Mr. Campbell answer for himself in one or two extracts of considerable length, and I have no doubt the reader will, from that source, feel more fully satisfied of the purity and disinterestedness of his motives in publishing this version of the New Testament, than from any defence I might offer. When this is completed, I shall, the Lord willing, take up the doctrinal points.—Next week's paper will contain an extract.

"Prove all things. Hold fast that which is good." "Holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, especially they of the circumcision (i. e., false orthodoxy); whose mouths must be stopped."—*Paul.*

F. M. BRUNER.

MONMOUTH, Ill., March 11, 1870.

The north wind driveth away rain: so doth an angry countenance a backbiting tongue.

Digitized by Google

ON DIVORCE.—INQUIRIES.

A brother sends us the following:

"EDITORS HARBINGER:—I have read the article in the Harbinger of Jan., 1870, entitled "A Tragedy and Its Lesson." My object is to call your attention to one sentence, viz.: "There is nothing in the New Testament law of marriage that is not as applicable, practicable and necessary outside of the church as within it."

"I have heretofore been taught that those outside could not obey the law of Christ, and further, that no law of Christ, save the law of naturalization, was given to any but the church.

"Paul is very clear on this subject. See I Cor. vii. 10–15. The Corinthians asked Paul what the law was when a husband and wife—*both members of the church*, quarreled, or quarreled and parted? Paul replies, "I command, *yet not I but the Lord*," &c., evidently referring to what the Savior said, Matt. xix. 9th. The next question they asked was this,—What is the law when a Christian has a partner who believeth not, and similar difficulties arise? Paul replies, "To the rest speak I, *not the Lord*," &c.—Here he plainly asserts that the Lord laid down no law where one of the parties—either husband or wife—was an unbeliever, but he lays down the law for the first time. If the Lord laid down no law where only one was an unbeliever, he certainly laid down no law where both were unbelievers.

"It will not do to say that Paul meant by what he said in the 10th verse that he was inspired, and in the 12th verse that he was not inspired, for he did not need to be inspired to say in the 10th and 11th verses what the Savior had already said, but he did need to be inspired to say what he said in the 12th to the 15th verse, as he plainly contradicts the Savior, if what the Savior said was 'applicable' to unbelievers.

"What does Paul mean in the 15th verse, when he says, 'A brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases'?"

The questions involved in our brother's letter are worthy of attention, and we will try to answer them as well as we can.

When we said,—"There is nothing in the New Testament law of marriage that is not as applicable, practicable and necessary outside of the church as within it"—we referred, of course, to the substance of this law,—to what the New Testament taught of

Digitized by Google

the spirit and conduct, the mutual, necessary duties and obligations, involved in this institution of God;—we did not say, that the law as given to the church, and because given to the church, applies also to the world without,—that is, that those that are without are to be placed under the law of Christ, *in the church.*—The form of our statement forbids such an interpretion.

That husband and wife should be one flesh,—is a law originating neither in the law of Moses or Christ,—but was a law *in the beginning*, resulting from the design in the creation of the two;—thus covering the whole human race, (Math. xix. 5; Mk. x. 6–9); and from this *original* purpose and law of God, in 'creation,' and from no subsequent, arbitrary enactment, Christ deduces the conclusion, by a 'therefore'—"What, therefore, God has joined together, let not man put asunder;"—and whatever Christ meant by this declaration, is a law, for all mankind. "*What*, therefore, God hath joined together,"—does this refer only to Christians? Did not Christ have reference also to the Jews whom he was addressing? If so, it is a law not originating in the church of Christ, nor exclusively for it. The grounds of this law, and the law, existed before Jews or Christians. Are those only so joined together, who are married as Christians? Who will affirm this, and risk the consequences resulting from such an affirmation?—But, then, "whom God has joined together"—how? by a special divine ordinance in the church, Jewish or Christian? Does Christ so affirm? Not in the least! No! The 'joining together' is as given in vss. 4 and 5,—in the 'creation' and the divine purpose of the creation of man and woman, 'in the beginning.' It is a law, then, as wide as humanity—as wide as the divine creation of man and woman extends. But, then, again—"what God has" so "joined together *let not man* put asunder"!—*man*, not the church, not an ecclesiastical statute, only—but *man* anywhere in the wide bounds of humanity. Now, whatever Christ means by this declaration and law, whatever is embraced in it, is clearly of universal application, as in the divine intention; there could, of course, be no question at all, as to the *church of God* setting aside or dissolving an act of God; 'man' cannot here be synonymous with the 'the church,' or be limited by it. What this declaration involves, let the context show. The second part of Christ's declaration is as wide as the first.

"I have heretofore been taught that those outside could not

Digitized by Google

obey the law of Christ," &c., &c. To this we answer:—An unbeliever, or non-Christian, cannot obey the whole law of Christ, because there are things in it peculiar to the Christian state, which a man only *as a Christian* can perform. He cannot obey the law of Christ as such, for he is not under it, does not recognize it, and has not the spirit of Christ, that legitimates and sanctifies such acts of obedience. But that there are not many things embraced in the moral law of the New Testament which the non-Christian *can*, and even in his state, should do, and for which God will hold him to account, as well as for his sin in rejecting Christ, is certainly not true. Lie not, steal not, murder not, obey the powers that be, as good citizens, honor the king,—are among the items in the moral law of the New Testament;—will any one say that these injunctions cannot and need not be obeyed by non-Christians, and that they are not responsible to God for the violation of these? And so, among many other like things, indispensable to the purity, peace and prosperity of individual, social, and national life, are also duties of married life, on which indispensably rest its purity, peace and prosperity. We are not imposing these duties on non-Christians, as a law of the church, but are speaking of the possibility, propriety, and necessity of these duties outside as inside of the church, as essential to the proper character and conduct of marriage in society. The laws, or duties concerning marriage are not arbitrary, but such as necessarily arise from the nature of the relation, according to the divine intention in its institution itself.

But, that husband and wife are legitimately joined together,—that is, joined by divine authority in marriage; that they are 'one flesh'; that the husband is the head of the wife; that the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man, (for all this is by purpose of *creation*—Matt. 19: 4–6; 1 Cor. 11: 9); that the wife should reverence and "submit to the husband"; that they should mutually love each other, as they do themselves; that they should regard the union a complete one, for life, to be broken by no slight cause,—by that only which is an actual, real, moral and bodily dissolution of this oneness of body and soul, as explained in the general law given by Christ, Matt. 5 and 9 chpp.; —does not all this apply, and is it not as suitable, in its divine uses and purposes, and as 'practicable' certainly,—(for why not?) and as 'necessary' to the purity and the enjoyment, and the carry-

Digitized by Google

ing out in all respects of the purposes, of marriage out of the church as within it? We think this ought to be beyond all question. For,—would any think or say, that the purity, duties and blessings of marriage are more easily reached and maintained in the world than in the church? Or which of all these things we have mentioned are in their nature such that they *cannot* be applied, and are not practicable or necessary, outside of the church as well as in it?—and *this* is precisely what we mean by the statement excepted against.

It is, however, certainly true, in this as in all other matters, that the Spirit of Christ inspires men with higher and holier motives, and gives higher and holier conceptions of all pure relations of life and acts of human conduct, than the unbeliever can know.

Further as to the idea that God's authority and law are limited to the church,—that outside of the latter there is free license so far as divine law is concerned,—we call attention to the fact, that, according the New Testament, *governments* are also of God, are God's ordinances, and in their special sphere, outside of the church, are representatives and bearers of the divine will and authority; Rom. 13. The governments and laws of society are not, then, beyond God's authority and law, but under it and responsible to it. It would be a denial of God's presence and rule,—a rebellion against him, and most dangerous and fatal to teach men, that a licentious freedom is granted to them, because not in the church,—a freedom from the great moral obligations of the law of God in society, which he himself has ordained. The Bible teaches no such doctrine. On the contrary, it holds individuals and nations, outside of the church, responsible to God for their keeping or violating the laws of righteousness and purity.

But now as to the case in 1 Cor. vii.

Paul, here, is laying down no laws whatever for unbelievers,—they would not have heeded them; his directions are altogether to the church. He does, however, declare of the unbelieving husband that he is 'sanctified by the believing wife,' and the unbelieving wife is 'sanctified by the believing husband' and that thence their children are holy,—that is, plainly, that the marriage relation between the believing and unbelieving is a *holy one*, one recognized by and under the law,—the holy law, of God;

Digitized by Google

were this not so, the relation would be an unholy, illegitimate one, and the children would be 'unclean,' 'but now are they holy.'

Paul does not even, in any direct manner, lay down a law for the unbelieving husband or wife; he does not speak of the sin or offence of these abandoning the other, because they are Christians. Are we, therefore, to infer from this, that such abandonment is allowable *before God*, is beyond the reach of any divine law, because they are unbelieving?

"If the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or sister is not in bondage in such a case." Certainly; the unbelieving daparts maliciously, because the other is a Christian, abandoning him or her as husband or wife, with the evident purpose doubtless, of being free to contract another marriage;—this is the case, and not one of simple improprieties of life less than adultery, *while still claiming and holding to the relation of husband or wife.* Now, of course, the Christian is not in such bondage as to follow the one that has utterly rejected him. The unbeliever must be suffered to depart,—not because he has a right to do so, or is free before God to do as he pleases. Such an abandonment must evidently in its purposes and acts, involve the highest guilt, must be an extreme act, so as to break in itself the holy tie of marriage, involving as we have intimated, the complete and wilful abolition, on his part, of the relation with all the consequences naturally, in those times and countries, following such an act, and with the evident purposes involved in it on the part of the guilty one.

Let it also further be observed that the apostle does not lay down any grounds justifying the believer in 'departing.' When the unbeliever departs, and with the intention of a final separation with its evident consequences,—he is to be allowed, of course to depart. "The believer is not to be in bondage in such a case." Interpreters are not settled as to whether this means that the abandoned may marry again or not. But granting that such liberty is here given, are we to suppose that the believer, after such abandonment is to be in haste to marry again? is not to wait to see the completion of such abandonment, with its evident results? This would be to contradict the whole spirit and teachings of Christian morality on this subject. Paul could mean and teach nothing like this. We call attention to another point. It is

Digitized by Google

claimed that the prescribing of conjugal infidelity as the only justifiable grounds of divorce, holds good only when husband and wife are both Christians. This suggests some grave questions. Does it mean, then, that a husband is to be allowed, *because he is a Christian, by peculiar privilege of the holy law of Christ*, all other wrongs, except adultery, toward his wife and that she cannot break the bonds; but that if he were an out-sider he could have no such forbearance? Does the Christian church grant such *peculiar indulgences* to its members? This would be a curious morality to proclaim to the world! But, besides this singular moral feature of this position, there are other difficulties in the way.—All this assumes that, as adultery only separates,—that before any one reaches this extreme act in his conjugal relations, he may be guilty of all other offences against morality and his wife,—among them drunkenness, neglect of his family, general profligacy, &c., *still as a Christian*,—for he must reach the climax of conjugal infidelity *as a Christian*, to make this rule good;—he must be a member of the Church to be permitted to pass safely over these lower steps of offenses and *as a Christian* reach the upper, the last. How does this look? Would not these lesser sins separate the offender from the church?

Is not the real spirit of the New Testament on this subject, so far as relates peculiarly to Christians, this, that the Christian in this, as in all other things of life, has by the Spirit of Christ a higher and holier regard for the conjugal relation, whether joined to a believer or unbeliever, than the non-Christian would have?—that it is the peculiar regard, in his own heart, for the relation, with the love and duties belonging to it, that makes the difference between him and an unbeliever, and not the fact, simply, as to whether his wife is also a member of the church or not? Everywhere else in the New Testament the highest devotion is taught on the part of the disciples of Christ, to all the duties of life, and in the highest degree in the relations of the family, whether the members of the household are fellow-disciples or not. A Christian is to exercise himself in all the laws of morality as strictly and holily, in justice and purity, in forbearance and charity, to the non-Christian as to his brethren.

As to the form of expression in v. 12,—"But to the rest speak I, not the Lord,"—we may compare in the same chapter vss. 25 and 40. In the case of those living with unbelievers, as distinct

Digitized by Google

from the preceding one, Paul gives his own 'judgment,' as in the cases of widows and virgins. And he gives his 'judgment' in these several cases, occurring at the same time and in the same church, and treated of in the same connection, as one who has a large knowledge of God's law, of experience (vs. 25), and as one that has the Spirit of God. The same amount of divine wisdom in Paul was needed in these three cases. The 'difficulties' in the case of those intermarried with unbelievers, are not, from any intimation given, the same as in the previous case between believers; the language does not suggest anything like that. "If he be pleased to dwell with her," intimates rather that the 'difficulty' would be that one has become a Christian. So interpreters understand it, and we think justly. This gives a different view than if we assume merely a difficulty between husband and wife, as in vss. 10 and 11. Paul applies to this new case the spirit of the law of Christ, as interpreted by himself.

Finally, let all special cases, in any class, be harmonized with the general law governing such class. For marriage there is such a general, great law in the Bible, based on the original purpose of God in creating man and woman for a life-long oneness which sin alone has interfered with and limited;—Christians should be the last to desire, in any way, to modify or violate this law, or be the apologists for such violation.

Much more could be said on the questions here discussed, and better than we have said it; but this must suffice for the present.

C. L. L.

AMERICAN BISHOPS AGAINST PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

A very significant piece of news comes to us from Rome,—a prayer of American and other Bishops from the English world, to the Pope that the dogma of infallibility may not be proposed to the Vatican Council for discussion,—and, consequently of course, not for adoption. This is the petition :

"*Most Holy Father:* Humbly prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, we most earnestly supplicate that the question on the definition of the infallibility of the Sovereign Pontiff as a dogma of faith may not be proposed to the Vatican Council.

"First—Because the discussion of this question will evidently

Digitized by Google

show a want of union, and especially of unanimity, among the Bishops.

"Second—Because, on account of the circumstances in which we are placed in countries where heresies not only exist with impunity, but are dominant, this definition, instead of attracting, would alienate those whom we seek by all Christian means to lead to the true fold of Christ.

"Third—Because we anticipate endless questions will arise, which may interfere with and prevent the work of our ministry, and cause the fruits of this Council to be lost to those who are members of the holy Catholic Church. Having laid bare our hearts and sincere intentions, we implore Almighty God to avert all evil from the Church, and that He may illumine and direct you with His Holy Spirit.

"J. B. Purcell, Archbishop of Cincinnati; Peter R. Kenrick, Archbishop of St. Louis; John McCloskey, Archbishop of New York; George Errington, Archbishop of Trebizond (*in part.*); Thomas Connolly, Archbishop of Halifax; Richard Wheelan, Bishop of Wheeling; Augustine Verot, Bishop of Savannah; James R. Bayley, Bishop of Newark; John Sweeny, Bishop of St. John, N. B.; Bernard McQuade, Bishop of Rochester; Tobias Muller, Bishop of Erie; Francis McFarland, Bishop of Hartford; James M. O'Gorman, Bishop of Omaha (*in part.*); James Rogers, Bishop of Chatham, Canada; Michael Domenec, Bishop of Pittsburg; Patrick Lynch, Bishop of Charleston; Thaddeus Arnat, Bishop of Mastery; David Moriarty, Bishop of Kerry and Aghadoe; William Clifford, Bishop of Clifton, Eng.; Edward Fitzgerald, Bishop of Little Rock; John Leahy, Bishop of Dromore; John Hennessy, Bishop of Dubuque; Patrick Feehan, Bishop of Nashville; John Hogan, Bishop of St. Joseph, Mo.; John Henni, Bishop of Milwaukee; David Bacon, Bishop of Portland; Joseph Melcher, Bishop of Green Bay; Ignatius Mrak, Bishop Sault Ste Marie."

Here we have the most eminent names of the American Bishops, with five Archbishops, and the list is headed by Purcell, of Cincinnati. The document is brief and clear as to the sentiments of the signers.

Thirty-three years ago, Bishop Purcell, in his debate with A. Campbell at Cincinnati, expressed himself several times on the question of the Pope's infallibility. On page 172 of the debate,

Digitized by Google

he says, "Catholics hold that infallibility was promised to the Church by Jesus Christ. Its testimony is heard in a General Council, or in the Pope's decision in which all assent. The Church can subsist without a general Council. General Councils are not essential—though frequently of use, because, though we all believe *without exception* that the Pope's decision, in which after it has been once made known, all the Bishops of the Catholic world would acquiesce, is infallible, still the decision of a General Council declares in a more impressive and solemn, not more authentic manner, the belief of the Catholic world on the contested doctrine, and thus more effectually proscribes the contrary error."

This sounds a good deal like claiming infallibility for the Pope in the matter of doctrine. But other expressions of the Bishop are more explicit. On page 24 he says: "The Pope never gives a decree without taking counsel from his constitutional advisers, availing himself of the light of present wisdom and past experience. He takes all human means to weigh the subject well and to come to a sound scriptural conclusion." As it is possible, therefore, for these aids to be neglected or to fail, it is possible for the Pope to err, so that he is not necessarily, and inevitably, in this view, infallible.

Again, page 32: "We acknowledge no mere human authority between us and God. We are free and untrameled as any people under heaven. It is not the man, but the authority we respect. The man may err, and if the Pope claims a power not belonging to him, we soon remind him of his mistake. How this lesson has been taught to a few Popes, the history of the church will show." There is no difficulty in verifying the last words of this passage. Several of the Popes were severely humbled by the Councils, for their assumptions and errors; such as Liberius, Vigilius, Honorius, and Eugenius IV. Liberius apostatized from orthodoxy and fell into semi-Arianism. To get back to Rome, from which he had been exiled by Constantius, he signed a heretical formula of faith,—that is, Arianism. "Pope Vigilius issued a solemn decree declaring orthodox a book which the fifth general Council condemns as full of grievous errors against the faith. The sentence of excommunication falls on all defenders of the polluted book, even the Pope. If the Pope had not revoked his *Constitutum*, or decree, if he had not adhered to the Council and its de-

Digitized by Google

cisions, he would have been deposed. Honorius, in his two celebrated letters to the eastern patriarchs, favors or teaches the Monothelite error. His letters and his memory are condemned in the severest terms by three general Councils, and by the Popes who ruled after the sixth. Eugenius IV fulminated against the Council of Basle, when it was yet legitimate, bulls full of anathemas. He declares it faithless to its mission, guilty of the greatest excesses, an enemy to the Church, and annuls its principal acts. Soon after, a new bull revokes the former, proclaims the legitimacy, the authority, the holiness of this Council he had before reproved and rejected."*

These and others Purcell had perhaps in his eye in his reference to "the few Popes" who had been taught the lesson that they were not infallible, nor absolute in authority.

On the 22d page, however, the Bishop gives the fullest utterance to his faith on Papal infallibility. His words are: "He (Campbell) says, they did not believe the Pope of Rome to be infallible. This is granting to the Catholics the whole mooted question. The question is clearly settled by this admission.—Appeals were lodged before the Bishop of Rome, though he was not believed to be infallible, neither is he now. No enlighted Catholic holds the Pope's infallibility to be an article of faith.—I do not; and none of my brethren that I know of, do. The Catholic believes the Pope, as a man, to be as liable to error as almost any other man in the universe. Man is man, and no man is infallible, either in doctrine or morals. Many of the Popes have sinned, and some of them have been bad men. I presume my worthy antagonist will take his brush in hand and roll up his sleeves, and lay it on them hard and heavy; so will I; and whenever he uses a strong epithet against them, I will use a stronger."

This is to be noticed, however, that the appeal to the Pope is made by these Bishops on the ground of the impolicy—cf the evil effects, of bringing the question of infallibility before the Council, not because they reject the doctrine as false.

Policy has ever had a great influence at Rome; and these Bishops know it. They understand the world far better than the Italians who have been reared in the shadow of the Vatican, and

* *Le Concile General.* Maret. tome 2. pp. 79–80. Maret is a Catholic bishop and at the present council at Rome. He is known as the bishop of Sura, *in partibus.*

Digitized by Google

in the murky atmosphere that surrounds it,—in Italy, where for centuries the priests have had free sway, can learn nothing, and have thought of nothing and cared for nothing but the aggrandizement of their own importance and power, and that of their idol, the Pope. To Protestants it does not matter whether this extreme dogma be declared or not; but to intelligent Catholics who stand in the face of an enlightened world, and who wish well to their Church, it does matter a great deal.

The Pope and his Italians will not relish the lesson of this appeal, and doubtless will ascribe it to the perversion of the minds of these Bishops by living among heretics, in a free country, where, as Pope Gregory, the predecessor of Pius IX, said, the pest of free speech and a free press prevails. C. L. L.

LETTERS FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

LETTER VII.

ANASTASIS—CONTINUED.

DEAR BRO. LOOS:—The argument of Bush from Reason comes before me in this letter.

1. "The constituent particles of the body are continually varying; the man who dies at seventy, has had ten different bodies; which of these is to be the body of the Resurrection?" The short answer to this would be, the body which died is the one which will be raised. But this would be rather too naked. The philosophy of the passage is shallow. The change of particles is true,—the *ten different* bodies simply a monstrous fiction. The change of particles is even a more rapid process than our Professor supposed. He might have reckoned *seventy* different bodies int he room of ten. Nothing has surprised us more than the use which a certain class of theologians have made of the physiological fact. According to their seven years fable, we might suppose that an old body was slowly marching off the stage in a seven years' pilgrimage, and a new body marching on the stage in the same stately manner. But there is no difficulty when the matter is fairly looked in the face. The conflict between vital and chemical forces is a harmony, not a ruin. There is continual waste and continual repair in the material organism, particle succeeding particle in the living structure, but there are no different

Digitized by Google

bodies; the body remains the same in all the stages of growth or decline. Identity of body is a fact independent of spiritual unity. The scars and blemishes of the boy remain with the mature man and the old man. Certain diseases of an infectious kind which he had in youth, are his protection in middle life and in old age. Notwithstanding fresh particles, he is effectually saved from any further visitation.

II. Some theologians confound consciousness with identity.—Their formula would stand thus: 'A man is what he is because he knows it.' But surely the proof or evidence of a truth cannot be the truth which is to be proved. The theory is false and absurd. An idiot ar a man in a trance may lose his consciousness, but his identity remains as a reality. We can single out that noble tree where we carved our name in boyhood, though it has no spirit or consciousness. It is subject likewise to change of particles, as well as man, but it retains its position, nature and configuration, and we can distinguish it from others. If God were to infuse soul and spirit into St. Paul's, in London, it would not help us in the least to distinguish it from St. Peter's, at Rome,—because we need no help. We are in no danger of confounding one cathedral with the other. If our grand river, the Mersey, had a reasonable soul and conscious life, it would not be any more an identical fact, a separable verity; we can distinguish it very well now from the greater but not brighter floods, the Amazonian rivers which roll in your great country.

III. "The resurrection body is to be a spiritual and not a material body. The reassembling of material particles can result only in the reconstruction of a material body, and a material body cannot be at the same time *spiritual.*" This is a decided plunge into the domain of bathos, and if pursued to its logical consequences, would land us among the ancient heretics, who found that *matter* was radically bad,—so evil and intractable that it was not made by God, but was either an eternal hostile force, or called into existence by some infernal spirit. But our original Father Adam was glorious in body as well as in spirit, and all the materialism holy. God saw that his work was good, and his overshadowing wings were pavilion for sanctity and beauty. Spiritual, as it stands in the apostle's statement, is not the converse of material, but of natural. A pure, or simple, spirit could have no body of any kind, but as soon as ever it is clothed, material-

Digitized by Google

ism is present, however much it may be rarefied or sublimated.—Even now, in the midst of great ruin, we still have spiritual men; but according to our Professor's reasoning, spiritual men must be phantoms, not substantial beings, with proper organism. In fine, a spiritual body is simply a body delivered from all carnal uses, and forever devoted to the spiritual. Even at present our bodies may be temples for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit; how much more so when mortality is swallowed up of life, and all the enemies, disease, passion and darkness, flee away forever.

IV. "Why shall preference be given to these particular bodies, when, as is well known, they are often withered and wasted by consumptions, swollen by dropsies, mangled by wounds, made hideous by deformities, curtailed of limbs, or become partially putrefied by gangrene." I had a rapid day-dream after reading this passage. On a dread day there came crowding from earth and sea a swarm of creatures ready for the hospital and lazar-house of the next age. In skeleton leanness, in dropsical fullness, in corrupting gangrene, some without limbs, and some with humps on the back and cancers in the stomach. Bush was standing near me, and he said, There! didn't I tell you so?—the whole thing is wretched, and there is no glory in it. But this ill-favored phantasma speedily vanished. The trumpet sounded, and a sun-bright throng appeared, all distinguishable, but all perfect and glorious. I still had the Professor within speaking distance, and I was able to say, 'What ever made you dream that if God raised men, he must likewise raise their maladies and imperfections? It is surely not necessary that God should raise disease and deformity—as if these things, which are foreigners and enemies, belonged to the essential structure of humanity.'—We shall be changed; this corruption must put on incorruption, and this mortal put on immortality. As to men without their proper limbs, of course such limbs must be supplied, for there can be no privation, malformation or deformity of any kind when the children of the Resurrection appear. If Bush or his friends were to say, 'Does not this involve the absolute destruction of the old body, and the formation of one perfectly new?' I reply, certainly not. Leave to God the same power which his dear Son revealed on earth. The men with withered limbs, or the men born blind, on whom our Lord revealed healing or creating power, remained identically the same. The man who cast off the

Digitized by Google

scales of his leprosy had the same body as before. He could energize the old organism, however withered, or wasted, or palsied, pouring in the tide of life. He could put eyes into the sockets without taking down the old structure and building up one entirely new.

V. "The particles that now belong to one body have previously belonged to some other; whose shall they be in the resurrection? As the Sadducees asked respecting the wife of seven husbands." Bush pursues this difficulty in a long passage. He sees waving harvests made fruitful by dead men; men and beasts feeding on the grain and grapes, and cannibals feeding on human flesh; on the whole, he presents the Almighty with a considerable difficulty. Bush did right to bring in the Sadducees, for his own question was as relevant as theirs, and might be answered in the same manner: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." We may, however, without rebuke, say a little more. That the particles which compose our corporeal structure do enter at death into varied combinations, cannot be denied.—But an author whose work I read with pleasure many years ago, says, "It cannot be proved that the *same particles of matter* have ever borne a relation to *two* human beings, so as, the *second time*, to compose a part of a human being at *death*." Such a thing *might* be, unless God has decreed otherwise; but as we believe that He has decreed otherwise, we cannot allow any improved possibilities to stand in the way of a veritable resurrection from the dead; nor do we think that there will be any quarreling among the claimants, any dispute over particles of matter in that great day. "Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God should raise the dead?"

VI. "Thousands and millions of human bodies that were once deposited in graves are not there now, and never will be again. Their tombs are cenotaphs, or empty monuments. How can these bodies be raised out of their graves at the last day?" This is a misapprehension of the word of God. It is not declared in holy writ that all men shall be raised out of their graves, but that all that are *in their graves* shall come forth. But it is taught that all the dead shall arise, and all the sleepers be awakened. Hence the reality of the work is not affected by the place where the ashes of mortality lie. On the mountain top, or in the gloomy cave, under the clover sod, or at the bottom of the

Digitized by Google

sea,—no matter. The work of God is one; hence it matters not whether the dead be scattered in the dust of desert places, or waiting for burial in chambers desolate and silent. Come when it may, that voice of the archangel which thrills with the shock of life,—there will be uncounted thousands either lying in houses of tears and sorrow, or in the drear procession towards the house of darkness. All wait for the return of Him who is the resurrection and the life.

VII. "Guided by the mere letter of Scripture, it is common to hear mention made of the body raised from the grave at the sound of the last trumpet, and of its coming out of the tomb or sepulcher in which it was interred." This we concede is Scripture language. Still we are at full liberty to inquire into its meaning, and to institute the most rigid comparison between the literal averment of holy writ and the inevitable deductions of our reason, founded upon the ascertained results of science. "What is meant by the resurrection of the body, and what the *relation* which the body bears to the body that is raised?" The same relation, Mr. Professor, which subsists between the body with which you go to sleep at night, and that in which you awake in the morning. It is true that the change will be great, the transformation wonderful, and that the house when raised up, will be more glorious than when it fell to the ground; but this brings no element of difficulty. Bush would himself admit, that during his midnight slumber there are changes passing over him, but he is quite sure about his identity, and has no doubt a tolerably firm conviction that he is responsible for the deeds of the day before. Can the Professor tell us what relation there was between the body of Adam as it lay on the earth, and the man after God breathed into him the breath of life, making him a living soul? When he tells us this, we will tell him what relation there is between a dead body and a body delivered from death by the power of the Creator, and re-inhabited by soul and spirit. We get unclothed when the frail tabernacle is dissolved; we get clothed upon when the Lord descends from heaven to quicken the body of humiliation, and fashion it like to his own.

The principle of interpretation enunciated by Bush is more than doubtful. Men who are satisfied by historical and moral evidence concerning the supreme authority of the word of the Lord, will abide by its literal averments, notwithstanding the de-

Digitized by Google

ductions of science. When they gather the meaning of their Lord by the grammatical construction of his words, every thing else must be silent. They can afford very quietly to bow to the door any of the deductions of science or any of the pretensions of philosophy, being convinced that their doctrine has been delivered by the best and the greatest teacher. G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, March 1st, 1870.

METHODISM ONCE MORE.

Bro. Pinkerton, in the last *Independent Monthly*, notices *A Demand Answered* in the last *Harbinger*, as follows:

"PROFESSOR LOOS AND METHODISM.—Nothing that I have written for the INDEPENDENT MONTHLY as far as I can recollect, has been noticed by any of the periodicals of the Reformation, except an article on "Flesh and Spirit," and one on "Organization." The former was made the subject of comment by the *Christian Standard*: the latter by the *Millennial Harbinger*. I was reluctantly compelled to regard the strictures of both periodicals as eminently uncandid and unfair. Neither paper published my corrections and explanations.

"In the *Harbinger* for April, brother Loos returns to the subject of Methodist hierarchial despotism. I have neither room nor inclination for reply—a mere suggestion can be here offered. I did not call upon Professor Loos to prove that the affairs of the Methodist Church are committed to the management of her ministers. This was not denied. This was the *pith* of our statement: *No man is compelled to enter the Methodist Church, or its ministry: or, being there, to remain one week after he wishes to leave.* Where, then, is the 'despotism?' Were a man compelled, by any kind of law, to enter a church. or to remain in it, or, being out of it, to contribute to its support, there would be galling despotism. But in this country, where, among fifty churches, a man may select the one he prefers, and which he may leave whenever he pleases to do so, I am unable to see wherein he is oppressed.

"The truth is, no man can do always just as he pleases, in a church or out of it. Almost, if not quite, all general rules operate harshly in some cases; and *absolute freedom*, anywhere within the domain of law, is a baseless dream. While, therefore, we advocate only such ecclesiastical organizations as allow the largest

Digitized by Google

liberty compatible with efficiency of operation, and tend to call into exercise, to the largest extent possible, all the energies of the whole membership, we object to all attempts to fasten upon any church the charge of despotism, where there is no shadow of compulsion in any direction—where all the rules of the church are widely published, and every man who enters its communion does so of his own free will and accord. If this is despotism, what would liberty be? P."

REMARKS.

The simple fact that a man can enter or leave, at will, the Methodist Episcopal church, is no proof that it is not a clerical or hierarchical *ecclesiastical absolutism.* As Judge Nelson, in the passages we quoted from him in the April Harbinger, said, where "any body of ministers have no constituents, and represent themselves alone; are the source and fountain of, and embody in themselves, *unrestrained, sovereign, unlimited spiritual, temporal and ecclesiastical power; and are responsible to no earthly tribunal for the manner of its exercise,*"—there is the most complete hierarchical absolutism; and this is the case with the Methodist Episcopal Church. That people choose, of their own free will, to accept of this clerical absolutism, or again to abandon it, does not change the bold, notorious fact of the actual existence of such absolutism *in* that church. When people enter it, knowing this fact, they simply agree willingly to put their neck under the yoke; when they abandon it, they resolve to take their neck out of the yoke. That is all. *Hierarchical absolutism in the church* does not mean that men shall be made to enter the church, or be kept in it, contrary to their will;—it simply means that the ministers have the absolute, that is, unlimited, irresponsible control over the church, in ecclesiastical matters;—so that they, the clergy, alone, "have the power to organize any number of churches, with any form of government that they chose; that they and their successors retained perpetually all that power, and could at any subsequent period, without violating any constitutional principle, modify, reconstruct, reorganize, and change its whole polity; or dissolve it entirely, and substitute in its place, two or as many more distinct, independent churches as they might desire,"—and that they have the power, according to the organization of the church, alone, to establish and change at their own pure will, the doctrines and discipline of the church. If this is not clerical abso-

Digitized by Google

lutism *in the church*, then there never was such a thing on earth. The objection of our brother would assume quite another thing, —that is, absolute control over the bodies,—the civil rights, of the members also; this, fortunately, they have not.

The Roman Catholic church is a hierarchical absolutism,—we quote the very language of its writers and books;—the only question in that church to-day is,—has the Pope alone "supreme, separate, absolute power as a monarch,"—or does this power belong to the *whole hierarchy, the Pope and the Bishops.* The people, the laity, in the Catholic church, as much as in the Methodist Episcopal church *are entirely excluded* from the government of the church, whether in its legislative, its judicial or in its administrative capacity. So the Catholic writers say, and so every body knows the Catholic church to be constituted,—one and the same all over the earth, in the United States as in Rome. And yet, not only in the free States of America, England, France or Germany, but in Italy itself,—wherever *temporal power* is not also united with the ecclesiastical, persons can at will enter or leave the church; does this abolish its character as a hierarchical absolutism?

Does voluntary servitude destroy the fact of servitude? Does the fact that young men have from America, England, Germany, France, entered the Jesuit order; have willingly surrendered their freedom and manhood, and made themselves passive instruments in the hands of their superiors,—have become, as their rules say, *ut cadavera*, 'as corpses,'—destroy the reality and extremity of their bondage? George Kobner, a noble German youth, educated in a German University with the freedom of thought that there breathes, but an ardent Catholic, so much so that he resolved to become a missionary, went to Rome to the Jesuit College *de Propaganda Fide*, being in admiration of the Jesuits from what he had seen and heard at a distance,—rose-colored. There, in the College, he saw young men crawling, at meals, under the tables in the refectory *on hands and knees*, and *kissing the feet of the other students*, as a penance for trivial offenses,—young men whom he recognized as once fellow-students in Germany—once men of free, erect heads and hearts,—now prostrate in their slavery of mind and soul, with servile, stolid look,—the mettle of their once bright souls all wasted,—their once proud freedom all lost. Yet—all this bondage was self-im-

Digitized by Google

posed; they came and entered the house of bondage of their own accord, and their self-imposed chains of spirit only held them there. Kobner refused the chains. Was this abject slavery any the less real or lamentable because self-imposed, or voluntarily retained? What does Paul mean when he says, "Know ye not that to whom *ye yield yourselves* servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey?" Can not a man, and does not a man *voluntarily yield himself* to the base bondage of Satan, as well as to the nobler service of God?

Finally, does not our brother often take occasion to denounce cowardice, intellectual and religious and spiritual slavery, where, whatever it is, it is certainly altogether voluntary?

We did not 'comment' on an article of Dr. Pinkerton on organization, but simply defended ourselves from his strictures.—As to our brother's charge of being 'eminently uncandid and unfair,' we know nothing in ourselves so eminently unworthy and ignoble as this charge expresses. C. L. L.

RELIGIOUS FAIRS.

They have had a big 'religious fair' in New York, to erect a building for the 'Sheltering Arms' institution, to be under the direction of the *Sisters of Mary*, a body of Episcopal ladies, under especial rules of charity and devotion; though the charge of the Romanistic tendencies of the Sisterhood, and also of the chaplain of the institution, is making serious trouble. At this 'fair,' or 'bazaar,' as these things are now sometimes prudently called,—for there is a good deal in a name,—there was a good deal of *pious gambling*, it seems,—much of it for the benefit of *clergymen*, which, we presume, 'sanctifies the gift,' and the method in which it was got. A New York paper says:

"This fair, which was opened for the purpose of raising funds to erect a large building for the 'Sheltering Arms,' was closed last Saturday. It lasted ten days and has proved an immense success pecuniarily, the proceeds amounting to about $45,000.—Tiffany & Co. donated to the fair a gold watch, to be given to the clergyman receiving the highest number of votes, at 50 cents a vote. Rev. Dr. Weston was the successful candidate, having received 1,804 votes out of 4,291 cast. Rev. Drs. Potter, Washburne, Montgomery, Conrad, and Pope Pius IX., were among

Digitized by Google

others who were voted for. A grand piano went to Mrs. Dr. Montgomery in a similar manner."

On this the *World*, a secular paper, thus comments:

"GODLY GAMBLING.—Morals deteriorate under this ordeal as much as manners. Of course, the fruitfulness of gambling as a source of revenue has not failed to attract the attention of the fair-directing mind. The element of human nature which makes gambling an immoral pastime is the yearning of the carnal mind to possess the object of its desire without rendering an equivalent. This feeling is very reprehensible, but also it is very general; and it has accordingly been worked by the fair for the fair to an extent which, if the fair were an undertaking for private profit instead of public beneficence, would surely subject the managers to the intervention of the police. The sacred poet remarks to the effect that

'Religion never was designed
To make our pleasures less,'—

and neither, according to the managers of religious entertainments, was it designed to diminish our profits. That form of hazard known to the irreligious gambler as 'raffle,' is known to the religious gambler under various less profane designations, but it remains equally contrary to the first principles of morality, and to the statute in such cases made and provided."

This is the comment of a secular newspaper on this *pious gambling*. The passion for introducing, at all hazard, the world, in its bad features even, into the church, the carnal into the religious, is ever-present, and ever-pressing; it began with the beginning of Christianity and will only end with the end of all things earthly. There is not an hour when this pressure is not felt in the church; the practices the carnal world has invented for its own pleasures, conveniences, and schemes, must be, by those Christians that are fond of inventions and strong in imitation, introduced into the church,—for what works successfully and agreeably in carnal things must, according to their logic, also work well in religious things. The arguments in behalf of such domestication of the world in the church are very abundant and prompt. It is sad to think that with many Christian people, and in many churches, the scandalous exhibition of raffling, lotteries, mock auctions, or real ones, selling things often utterly useless, or ten times their sale value, together with the endless, ridicu-

Digitized by Google

lous maneuvers, chicaneries and *trumperies*,—are not in themselves sufficient to show the utter unfitness of such practices in the church, or for the purposes of the church of Christ. We should rejoice,—if nothing else will cure some people,—to see the proper officers of the law arrest a nice batch now and then of these zealous religious people, preachers, elders, deacons and all, wives included, who are actually engaged in these raffles, lotteries, &c., for the good of the church;—we mean, *arrest them* for the good of the church. We protest against allowing in these things any monopolies to the church; the laws forbid it outside, and why tolerate it inside, of churches?

But the raffling or 'pious gambling' part is not all by a good deal that is bad in these religious fairs. The world wants into the church and the church wants into the world, in a bad sense; and we hear constantly arguments to justify this adulterous, polluting mixing up of things. The argument of expediency, of policy,—that base ware,—of 'ranging in with the progress of the age,' is rung into our ears. It is a dangerous argument, but most insidious in its stealthy approaching to our hearts. It is the old strategy of the temptation in the wilderness over again,—evermore repeated through the ages. Every ingenious device is to be borrowed from the world and used to make up for the deficiencies of the divine arrangements, in order to make religion more attractive and more successful than the New Testament order makes it. We see this all around, and often very near us.—We will not 'assist,' as the French say, that is, give our presence and countenance, at the unlawful marriage of the church and the world; we will not, as did Beecher and Frothingham at the illicit marriage in New York, aid in it or pray over it. We find daily more and more, that what *is* needed,—we say we *feel* it,—is a strong, vigilant resistance against the besieging temptation of worldliness around the gates of the church. C. L. L.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE STATE.

We have stated in a previous number that the Catholic church, through her highest authorities, holds tenaciously to the *freedom of the Church from the control of the State*,—denying the secular power all right of interference in the affairs, in any way, of the

Digitized by Google

church. The converse of this, however, she utterly and obstinately refuses to concede. We shall come to this again more fully hereafter; for the present we simply state the fact, and call attention to the actual attitude, in immediate practice, of the church in its interference with the order of the State,—in civil matters. It is utterly impossible with the Catholic church, constituted as it is, with its traditions, its laws, its maxims of doctrine and life, its very organization, to live in peace loyally with the liberal governments of the earth that become not its servants. Yes! it is utterly impossible. This huge, colossal power ruling many millions of heads, hearts and bodies, will yet give the world trouble; it will fight a mortal fight with the powers of the earth, with the governments and nations of to-day, that are in the glorious progress of freedom. Gloomily and fanatically, armed with its power of policies, and its control of the souls of men, it will, if the Vatican, with its servile bigot hordes of Italian bishops and monks, has its way,—and most likely it will,—challenge the world to a combat for victory or death. It is a grand battle! let it come! Superstition against the Gospel; bigotry against enlightened freedom; fanaticism against enlightened and evangelical reason; darkness against light! Let it come;—who can doubt of the issue?

But we intend, now, simply to note some facts in the history of this present struggle, with reference to the attitude of the Catholic church toward civil government. Let the reader remember the words of Archbishop Hughes we gave in a late number of the *Harbinger*, in which he declared that the Catholic clergy, from Pope to humble priest, never interfered in civil matters.

The Austrian government has entered on a career of freedom. It has shaken off—thanks to the shock received at Koeniggraetz by the superior power of Prussia—the incubus of priestly, of papal control in civil matters. Its steps in the way of enlightenment and liberation have been rapid. It now puts ecclesiastics on the same level, as to civil privileges and duties, as other citizens. They must be loyal as other citizens, to the supreme law of the land, the constitution. How does Rome take this? Rome? you ask,—what has Rome to do with the duties, the loyalty, of Austrian citizens? We shall see. All men occupying public offices of any kind in the Austrian Empire, must take the oath of loyalty to the Constitution. Last year the question was referred

Digitized by Google

by the Catholic ecclesiastics in Austria to Rome, whether they should take this oath. The following are the answers. The first is from the body at Rome that has charge of the questions of *conscience*—the Holy Penitentiary. It concludes as follows:

"As all professors at Universities, teachers, and indeed every one who occupies a public office in Austria, are required to swear or promise obedience to the Constitution of the empire under the following formula: I promise, in the place of swearing, that I will hold the Constitution inviolable, the question is,—is it permissible to swear this oath, or make this vow, with a good conscience? The Holy Penitentiary, after a full consideration of the above, replies: Such a vow or oath as is above described is not permitted. Given at Rome, in the Holy Penitentiary, on the 13th August, 1869."

The second is from the Pope himself. He says:

"Your paternity lately stated to his Eminence, the Cardinal Penitentiary, who informed me of the fact that you have received the reply of the Holy Penitentiary of the 13th August, which declares that a vow or oath to hold the Constitution of the Austrian Empire of the 21st December, 1867, inviolable, in the manner described, cannot be permitted. You ask further whether it is also impermissible to make such an oath or promise with the reservation, as far as the laws of God and the Church permit. As I had the honor of presenting this petition to the Holy Father, in an audience kindly granted me yesterday, I hasten to inform your paternity that his Holiness was graciously pleased to declare such a vow or oath may be made, when in the same context the reservation you mention is added, as far as the laws of God and the Church permit. Still, the Holy Father is of opinion that whoever makes such a vow or oath in this form, ought to avoid offences as far as possible, to let it be publicly known he is sufficiently authorized by the Holy Chair to make this oath or vow with the above reservation.

"ROME, Sept. 1, 1869."

Austria, so long the victim of Papal interference and dominion, has determined, in the spirit of its new freedom, to assert its sovereignty over its citizens, and to repel this Roman, papal insolence. The Austrian government, in view of the above decisions at Rome, has resolved that to no man shall such 'reservation' as Rome demands, be allowed; but that all oaths so taken shall be held null and void. This will lead to a direct conflict;—

Digitized by Google

we trust and believe that Austria will not yield; it cannot without utterly forfeiting all relf-respect, and abandoning all claims to independence as a nation and a government.

Spain,—for centuries the slave of priestly dominion, till she sank to the lowest depth of weakness and shame, and became the by-word among enlightened nations,—has finally shaken off her slumbers, and is making an effort to rise as a nation. She is, under immense disadvantages, struggling for free institutions. A new Constitution has been formed, in the interests of freedom, according to which the Catholic priesthood are shorn of their absolute control in many things. This is enough to make Rome curse it. We learn as follows from Madrid:

"MADRID, May 6.—Thirty-eight Spanish bishops announce from Rome their refusal to take the oath to the new Constitution of Spain.

"MADRID, May 8.—In reply to deputies to the Cortes, the Ministers of Justice and Finance declare that the state will no longer pay salaries to those bishops who refuse to take the oath to the new constitution; but the government cannot displace the bishops because it did not appoint them."

Wherever a government will not be the willing, obedient servant of Rome, its citizens are commanded, as in past centuries, to withhold their allegiance from it. Rome governs the nations, as the tribunal of highest instance. Not the free constitutions of the nations, but the voice of Rome, is the supreme law of the Catholic citizens of the governments of the earth. O. A. Brownson, the Catholic convert, and the ablest lay expounder of Catholic sentiment in America, in a recent letter says, with reference to the Constitution of the United States:

"If the Pope should declare an oath imposed by the Constitution contrary to the divine law, I could not in conscience take it; or if the Legislature should pass a law, and the Pope should declare that what it required of me is forbidden by the law of God, I could not obey it."

This is it,—as one has said, "Mr. Brownson's allegiance to this country depends, not on his own convictions of what is right, but on the will of the Pope; i. e., an American citizen's allegiance to our government is at the mercy of a foreign potentate."

Digitized by Google

And, we may add, the sentiments of this potentate, ruling thus over all a man's life and actions, having hold of his conscience, are as much as possible opposed to the principles on which our government is founded. What we love, he hates; what we esteem, politically, as the highest good, he has cursed as the most execrable abominations. In the *Syllabus* lately issued from Rome,—now before our eyes,—which is a gathering up of all that Rome hates and anathematizes in the present enlightened world, almost every great principle in which Americans glory, is anathematized in express terms. This we shall show ere long.

The preceding references show that the Catholic church forbids its citizens to be truly loyal to governments. We come to another fact;—the intermeddling of the 'spiritual order,' as Archbishop Hughes calls it, in the political affairs of States. The telegraph has announced to us, that in the important national election just over in France, on the emperor's *plebiscitum*, the Pope *recommended*,—a very modest word,—the bishops all to vote for it, and the bishops send word from Rome to their clergy, in harmony with the wishes of the Holy Father, to vote also for the *plebiscite*, and use their influence in the same direction with the laity. The proposal was for the bishops at Rome to send their vote home from there.

Belgium is a country that has a free constitution, where men vote freely, as in our country, but where the Romish clergy,—also as here,—seek to guide the hands of their flock in casting their votes, as well as their souls in getting to heaven. From this country an 'eye-witness' writes:

"Nowhere is Romish church influence carried out more openly and more naively than in Belgium, that deeply Catholic country. I stopped at a small place in Belgium on an election day, and observed the polling of the votes. Up came a priest at the head of some ten or twenty stalwart Belgian farmers, in blouses, each with his long staff in his hand, in single file. The priest, when he had come up to the poll, shouldered round facing it, and gave to each obedient voter the approved ballot, which was dropped into the urn by the man in the blouse. This was what might be called an intelligible procedure. No doubts about the object or the means."

The intermeddling of the Catholic clergy in political matters has for years created extreme hostility and trouble in Belgium

Digitized by Google

among the enlightened and liberal people of that State. But Rome cannot and will not give up this interference. She insists that all on earth is hers, as she has frequently declared. Let free nations teach her a lesson. C. L. L.

"THESE DISCIPLES OR THESE FISH—WHICH?"

MEANING OF JOHN 21: 15.

BRO. PENDLETON:—My attention has been called to a question by T. T. H., and an answer by yourself, under the above heading, in the January number of the Harbinger. Your conclusion is, that Jesus meant to ask Peter whether he loved him (the Savior) more than the other disciples loved him. "With respect to these (your brethren), Peter, do you love me more than they do?" Finding my mind unwilling to accept this interpretation, I will state my reasons, hoping that if I am in error it may be pointed out.

Doubtless all will admit that one of the two following interpretations gives the true meaning:

1. "Peter, lovest thou me more than these other disciples love me?" or,

2. "Peter, lovest thou me more than these things?" By "these things" is meant fishing, nets, fish, the sea, etc.

Now, the question is, which of these interpretations is the correct one? It is true, "we must look to the grammatical construction for the meaning" when that determines it; but when it fails, we must look elsewhere. With due deference to what you say about the construction in this case, it seems to me that it *does not* settle the question. "Lovest thou me more than these," is just as ambiguous in the Greek as it is in the English translation.

The rule for the genitive after the comparative degree is given by Kuehner in substance as follows: "The comparative degree takes after it the genitive when ἤ *(ee, than,)* is omitted; when ἤ *(ee, than,)* is expressed, it takes the same after as before it." This being true, if John had used ἤ *(ee, than,)* after the comparative, there would have been no ambiguity. In that case, if he had intended to express the thought in number 1, he would have written, "Lovest thou me—πλειον ηι ταυτα, *pleion ee tauta*—more than

Digitized by Google

thou lovest these things?" But he did not choose to use ἤ, *ee*, and the only other way was to use the *genitive case*, which, having in the plural the same form for all genders, gave rise to the ambiguity. It is clear that the writer, when he omitted ἤ, *ee*, would have written τουτων, *toutoon*, "these," in the genitive case, whether he meant by that term "these disciples" or "these things;" that is, he would have put that term in the *genitive*, whether, in the expanded sentence, it would have been in the *nominative* or the *accusative*.

In regard to the ambiguity which arises in this use of the genitive, Buttman says, "The ambiguity which sometimes thus arises can only be determined by the context." To the context we must therefore go. What are the facts? After the death of the Savior the disciples seemed to think their hopes were all gone, and they were inclined to go back to their former employments. Peter was foremost in this. He says, "I go a fishing." The others say, "We also go with thee," and he with six others started immediately. But they toiled all night and caught nothing. In the morning, as the light began to break over the eastern hills, the Savior stood on the shore. He then reveals himself to them in a miraculous draught of fish. But though there were so many there was no need of them, for when they came ashore they found a fire of coals with bread and fish laid thereon—a meal already prepared. The Savior intended by this to teach them to depend on him in all their straits. After they had eaten, the Savior addresses Peter: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?" and this question was repeated twice. Now as to the meaning of the question, we notice,

1. There was a rebuke intended for Peter in asking him this question. But there would have been *no rebuke* if the Savior merely intended to ask whether Peter loved him better than the other disciples did; for, it would have been right for Peter to do so if he could. But when he asked him whether he loved him better than 'these things' there was in the question a sharp rebuke.

2. Peter did not *know* whether he loved the Savior better than the other disciples did, for he was not yet "endued with power from on high," and yet his answers are in the *affirmative*. But he *did know* whether he loved his Lord better than those fish, etc., and hence he says "yes."

3. It would have been *invidious* for Peter to assert that his love

Digitized by Google

for the Savior was greater than that of the other disciples. It would have disparaged the others, and this feeling the Savior had often checked when it manifested itself among them. He would not therefore have asked a question that would excite such a feeling.

Taking all these things into account, it seems to me that the meaning is, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou *me* more than *these things*, your former occupation of fishing, &c.? If so, feed my lambs, and I will take care of you." J. C. K.

LOUISVILLE, KY., April, 1870.

LETTER FROM BRO. HENRY S. EARL.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—Once more, through the guidance and guardian care of our Heavenly Father, I am permitted to tread the shores of America. In company with our young brother A. T. Magarey, I left Australia, in the ship "Guiding Star," on Jan. 22nd, and arrived at San Francisco in safety and improved health on May 4th.

The leading objects of my visit are to lay before the brethren in America the important claims of "The Bible College of Australia," and obtain their hearty sympathy and aid, to enable us to firmly establish this great auxiliary to the church of Christ. I therefore request the attention of all the faithful brethren to the following document and particulars:

"ADELAIDE, South Australia, Jan. 3rd, 1870.

"We take pleasure in introducing and commending to your confidence and fellowship, our esteemed brother, Henry S. Earl, whose labors in Australia, in the Lords' cause, have been abundant and successful, and who is now about to visit America to present the claims of 'The Bible College of Australia,' of which he is the authorized Financial Agent. We trust his appeals on behalf of this necessary institution will be heartily responded to by the brethren, and that he will return to us laden with the substantial assurances that the brethren in America feel a deep interest in the Lord's work in this important field of labor. We have commenced the work in earnest and in faith, by educating under many difficulties and disadvantages, several suitable young brethren who have presented themselves for Biblical instruction, and

Digitized by Google

we have determined, by the Lord's help, to complete this much needed auxiliary to the church of Christ. One brother has promised *four thousand pounds* sterling, nearly equal to twenty thousand dollars, upon condition of an equal amount being subscribed. Owing to the commercial and pastoral distress which has so long existed in Australia, we feel it is impossible to raise the required sum without being largely assisted by the liberality of the friends of Jesus in America. To you therefore we appeal. Enable us to say that by the assistance of loving American Disciples of Christ we have been enabled to establish the first Bible College in Australia.

THOS. J. GORE, THOS. MAGAREY,
PHILIP SANTO, SAMUEL KIDNER,
G. L. SURBER, OLIVER A. CARR,
ANDREW THOMSON, WM. ROBERTSON,
JNO. S. PERRY."

For the further information of the brethren, I may add, that we purpose to have an Institution similar to the Bible College in connection with Kentucky University. As numbers of poor, but devoted and naturally gifted young brethren have not the means to support themselves whilst studying for "the ministry of the Word," we propose to establish a permanent fund, the interest of which will be devoted to the support of such brethren during their course of study. The imperative necessity of this institution will be apparent to all who study the following facts.

Six years ago, the cause we plead was almost unknown in Australia. *Now*, thousands listen to its claims every Lord's day.—*Then* not one Evangelist was in Australia. *Now* thirteen are wholly engaged in preaching the gospel. *Then* there were a few small churches meeting in cheap and unsuitable buildings. *Now* we have large and flourishing churches, meeting in neat and commodious chapels. *Then* a baptism was a rare occurrence. *Now* numbers are "baptized into Christ" every week. *Then* the number of the brethren did not exceed 700. *Now* we number about 3000. In brief I may further state, that during the past five years and nine months, nearly 2,500 have been added to the church of Christ—several chapels have been built, and others enlarged and refitted—four evangelists have been sent for to America with the necessary funds for their traveling expenses, and three have nobly responded to the call for co-laborers—all the available Australian talent in the churches has been brought into active ser-

Digitized by Google

vice, and five brethren have been qualified for evangelists, who are now successfully engaged in "winning souls to Christ."

Other young brethren we have who possess the natural qualifications for good evangelists, but require development and training in order to be useful and efficient preachers. We have also many places unoccupied, where "the fields are already white unto harvest," but we lack the preachers, and therefore cannot respond to the loud and urgent cry, "Come over and help us."—Brethren in Christ, we ask *your assistance* to enable us to qualify men to enter into those inviting fields; let not our appeal to you be in vain! We are doing all we can in Australia to meet these imperative requirements of the cause of truth and righteousness, and the great need of dying sinners. Will you not *help us* in our noble endeavors? Will you not aid us to establish the first Bible College in Australia, and thus help to establish firmly and permanently the cause of pure Christianity in Australia? We confidently hope you will do so, heartily and liberally. Disappoint us not in this our reasonable expectation, but freely and promptly haste to render us the required assistance. As it will not be possible for me to visit all the churches during my short visit of a few months, I am under the necessity of requesting all brethren who will assist us, to send their contributions to Henry S. Earl, care of Mr. E. Earl, Metamora, Woodford county, Illinois, and they will be thankfully received, and duly acknowledged.

Yours in Christ, HENRY S. EARL.

STAMMERING.

We are glad to call the attention of all who are suffering from this misfortune to the card of Prof. W. O. Clough, Paris, Ky., which says:

"STAMMERING CURED BY AN ART.—The time required to teach the art which will effect a cure, is generally from one to two hours. Entered according to an Act of Congress in the year 1869."

It seems a fact almost too strange to be believed, that a man who has not been able to speak at all for 20 years, should be made to speak fluently in an hour, by the observance of a few simple rules in speaking. But Bro. Clough assures me he has witnessed a number of cases of this kind during the past month, and is prepared to cure any who may apply to him for relief.

Digitized by Google

KNEELING AT THE THRESHOLD.

I'm kneeling at the threshold, weary, faint and sore;
Waiting for the dawning, for the opening of the door;
Waiting till the Master shall bid me rise and come
To the glory of his presence, to the gladness of his home!

A weary path I've traveled, 'mid darkness, storm and strife;
Bearing many a burden, struggling for my life;
But now the morn is breaking, my toil will soon be o'er;
I'm kneeling at the threshold, my hand is on the door.

Methinks I hear the voices of the blessed as they stand,
Singing in the sunshine in the far-off sinless land:
O i would that I were with them, amid their shining throng,
Mingling in their worship, joining in their song!

The friends that started with me have entered long ago;
One by one they left me struggling with the foe;
Their pilgrimage was shorter, their triumph sooner won,
How lovingly they'll hail me, when all my toil is done!

With them the blessed angels, that know no grief or sin,
I see them by the portals, prepared to let me in;
O Lord, I wait Thy pleasure, Thy time and way are best;
But I'm wasted, worn and weary; O Father, bid me rest!

—*Dr. Guthrie.*

L'ECHO DE PARIS.—BY PROF. WORMAN.

This little work, designed to assist the English student in acquiring an accurate knowledge of French idioms and the conversational phrases of every-day life, is admirably suited to its purpose. It is very complete, supplying just what is needed, without superfluity.....Mr. Worman has done his work well, and his volume cannot fail to be of very great assistance to all who wish to get a knowledge of *conversational* French. J. G. H.

Be not thou envious against evil men, neither desire to be with them; for their heart studieth destruction, and their lips talk of mischief.—*Prov.*

Digitized by Google

SUNDAY SCHOOLS—ATTENTION.

We will send, *postage paid*, back numbers of the Christian Monitor, for distribution in Sunday schools, at the low rate of *one dollar and a half per hundred*—(one cent and a half per number).

Address Mrs. M. M. B. Goodwin, Indianapolis, Ind.

BETHANY COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT, &c.

The Annual Commencement of Bethany College will be on Thursday, June 16th.

Meeting of the Board of Trustees, Wednesday, June 15th.

Annual Meeting of the Alumni of the College, Tuesday, June 14th, at 10 A. M.

Exhibitions of the Literary Societies, Wednesday and Thursday evenings.

C. L. Loos, Sec'y.

Good Words from Our Correspondents.

Columbia, Mo., April 29, 1870.

Dear Bro. Pendleton:—On last Sunday evening, an interesting meeting of near two weeks' continuance, closed in Columbia. The result was 37 additions, I believe. Bro. T. P. Haley, now of Platte city, did all the preaching,—assisted by the resident preachers. It was truly a glorious meeting, and we all deeply regretted to see brother Haley leave us. He is doing good service for the Female Orphan School, that we are trying to establish and endow, and I have no doubt we will succeed.

While Bro. Haley was here, I went to Jacksonville, Randoloph co., and spent a few days with the congregation, and Bro. J. A. Berry; 5 were immersed during our stay. Two were also immersed a few weeks ago, at Bethany, a few miles south of Columbia.

Yesterday I returned from Mexico, where I had to attend the district Missionary meeting, which commenced there last Tuesday. It was well attended,—nearly all the preachers in the four counties composing the district, being present, and many of the churches represented. The "Louisville plan," as it is called, was unanimously adopted; the brethren all expressed a determination to enter upon the missionary work with becoming zeal and activity,—all was harmony, union, and brotherly love. Bro. A. B. Jones was present, and is truly an efficient evangelist. He is "the right man in the right place"—is successfully re-

Digitized by Google

moving difficulties from the minds of many, and infusing a spirit among the congregations to work for the Master.

Affectionately your brother, T. M. ALLEN.

WINAMAC, Ind., April 14, 1870.

BRO. PENDLETON:—We are finishing up one of the largest and most comfortable houses of worship in this place. Our house is facing the public square, in the center of the town,—built upon the gothic style.

Bro. Carpenter of Wabash, held a four days' meeting at Star city, six miles from this place, last week and had 11 additions.

In the one hope, F. B. THOMAS.

IONIA, Mich., April 26th, 1870.

DEAR BROTHER:—I have been laboring as pastor of this congregation for 8 months. One result of my labors thus far is 122 additions to the church. O. EBERT.

WILLIAM'S CENTER, O., April 30, 1870.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Closed a fine meeting at Newville, Ind., the last of March, of four weeks' continuance, with 80 accessions,—67 by immersion. Have immersed 6 since meeting closed, in my field of labor.

In Christ, your brother, J. E. HARRIS.

ANTIOCH, O., May 4th, 1870.

EDS. HARBINGER:—During the last winter I held two protracted meeting at Texas, and one at West Union,—both places in Monroe co., Ohio,—embracing four Lord's days, and resulting in some 70 additions in all.

Am now engaged in an excellent meeting at this place; some 4 persons have already enlisted under Christ, the Captain of man's salvation.

Yours in the Lord, J. A. WALTERS.

WABASH, Ind, May 12, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—Within a few weeks past at meetings I have held, there have been added to the church as follows: Wabash, *twenty-three;* Star City, *eleven;* Logansport, *sixteen.*

At our reguler meetings here we are having frequent accessions. The Gospel is grandly succeeding all around us, and we confidently expect that it will continue to win victories, until very many more will bow to its divine authority.—Fraternally yours, L. L. CARPENTER.

Bro. J. C. Goodrich has organized a church of some 40 members in the city of Buffalo, and will watch over its interests,—at least for a time. We rejoice to hear this, as we know Bro. Goodrich to be a diligent thorough workman that needeth not to be ashamed. C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24.00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey.	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding - , -	25	Extra Cloth, - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edg s - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, - -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. Va.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., JUNE, 1870. [No. VI.

BAPTIZO IN THE HELLENISTIC, OR NEW TESTAMENT DIALECT.

(CONTINUED.)

We next refer to the use of *baptizo* by Josephus. The authority of this writer is of the highest value to us in determining the meaning of this word in Hellenistic or New Testament Greek.—First, Josephus was a *Jew;* he was born and educated in Palestine, and in the Jewish religion, and lived at Jerusalem to mature years. He was born only about thirty-seven years after Christ. He wrote in the time the New Testament was written, and wrote in the same diction—Hellenistic Greek—and in its best form among the Jews; he wrote as a cultivated scholar. His testimony in the question before us is decisive. How does *he* use the word baptizo? We will cite the several cases of its occurrence in his works.

Jewish Wars, B. 2, ch. 18, 4,—in describing the death of Simon, he says, "Stretching out the right hand, so as to be unseen by none, he plunged (baptized) the whole sword in his own neck." What does this mean? *Sprinkle, pour,*—or plunged, buried? A child can understand it.

Jewish Antiquities, B. 15, ch. 3: 3, he describes the drowning in a swimming-bath or pool, of the boy Aristobulus, by the command of Herod. He says, "Continually *pressing down and immersing* (baptizing) him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had completely drowned him."

Digitized by Google

He relates the same occurrence, *Jewish Wars*, B. 1, ch. 22: 2, as follows: "And there, according to command, being immersed (baptized) by the Gauls in a swimming-bath (or pool), he dies." Can baptizo here, by any imaginable possibility, mean sprinkle or pour? And this is Hellenistic Greek, written by a Jew in the days of the apostles!

Again, Jewish Wars, B. 3, ch. 8: 5, he says, "As I also account a pilot most cowardly, who, through dread of a storm, before the blast came, voluntarily submerged (baptized) the vessel."

Jewish Wars, B. 3, ch. 9: 3—describing the vessels in the port of Joppa, he says, "And many (of the vessels), struggling against the opposing swell toward the sea,—for they feared the shore, being rocky, and the enemies upon it,—the billow rising high above, submerged (baptized)."

In speaking of the prophet Jonah's flight by sea, he says,—*Antiquities of the Jews*, B. 9, ch. 10: 2,—"The ship being just about to be submerged (baptized)."

In his Life of himself, Sect. 3, he describes a shipwreck: "For our vessel having been submerged (baptized) in the midst of the Adriatic,—being about six hundred in number, we swam through the whole night." And again, he describes the fight with the Roman soldiers on the Lake of Galilee: "And when they returned to come near, they suffered harm before they could inflict any, and were submerged (baptized) along with their vessels;....and those of the submerged (baptized) who raised their heads, either a missile reached, or a vessel overtook." In like manner, figuratively, he says, *Jewish Wars*, B. 2, ch. 20: 1, "And after the calamity of Cestius, many of the distinguished Jews swam away from the city, as from a submerged (baptized) ship."

Here we have repeatedly *baptize* used to express the sinking of a ship under the water. Is it at all possible for any man to mistake the meaning of the word in this repeated use? *Can* it, by even the most ingenious device, be made here to signify pouring or sprinkling,—these meanings that are sought to be sustained by Hellenistic Greek? Here is Hellenistic Greek! and here baptizo means *submersion under the water*, and by no possibility anything else! Can anybody deny this? And if this is, as thus shown, the Hellenistic usage of this word, by authors writing at the same time, in the same dialect of the apostles, and by native Jews also, the point as to its New Testament meaning is settled.

Digitized by Google

There are several other instances of the use of baptizo in Josephus. Describing the purifying of the people during their mourning for Miriam, sister of Moses, he says: "Those there, who were defiled by the dead body, casting a little of the ashes into a fountain, and dipping (baptizing) a hyssop branch, they sprinkled, on the third and seventh of the days [the thirty days]." Here is the word for *sprinkling* used alongside of baptizo, but not synonymous with it; it denotes a very different action. The two words here cannot possibly denote the same act; this every one can see. It is the same series of actions as described for such purposes in Lev. 14: 15, 16: "And the priest shall take some of the log of oil and *pour it (epicheei)* into the palm of his own left hand. And the priest shall *dip (bapsei*—from *bapto)* his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall *sprinkle (ranei*—from *raino)* of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." The same *three actions*,—quite distinct,—in each case, all given in both cases, no two of them synonymous or to be confounded together. A child can understand this. In the old Latin version of Josephus this passage is thus given as to the word *baptizo*: "——*in aquam inmergentes*," &c.—*immersing into water.*"

There are several instances of the figurative use of the word—in the sense of *overwhelm*. *Jewish Wars*, B. 1, ch. 27: 1, he refers to the mock trial of Herod's sons: "This, as a final blast, *overwhelmed* (baptized) the tempest-tossed youths;" using the figure of a ship sunk by a storm.

Same work, B. 3, ch. 7: 15, the same figure is used. The people expostulate with Josephus when he purposes to leave Jerusalem. They say, "that it did not become him either to fly from the enemy or to abandon friends; or to leap off, as from a ship overtaken by a storm, into which he had entered in fair weather, that he would himself *overwhelm* (baptize) the city," &c.

Same Work—He says of the robbers that got into the city,—"Who, even apart from the sedition, afterwards *whelmed* (baptized) the city." This is a strong figure, clearly understood, of *plunging* a city into calamities. So David says, Ps. 69: 2, "I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me; . . . vs. 15, —let not the waterflood overflow me." So Job 22: 11,—"The floods of water cover thee." In all languages the word for *immerse*, is used in this figurative sense. Classic and Hellenistic writers, pagan and Christian, often so use it. Plato, in his Eu-

Digitized by Google

thydemus c. 7,—speaking of young Cleinias, confounded with the subtleties of the Sophists, says, "And I, perceiving that the youth was *overwhelmed* (baptized), wishing to give him a respite," &c. Shleiermacher translates baptize here by *ganz zugedeckt*—'quite covered up.'

Antiq. of the Jews, B. 10, ch. 9: 4, describing the murder of Gedaliah by his own guests, after he became intoxicated, Josephus says, "Seing him in this condition, and *plunged* (baptized) by drunkenness into stupor and sleep, Ishmael, leaping up, with his ten friends, slays Gedaliah and those reclining with him at the banquet." So also in classic usage. Plato, *Symposium*, ch. 4, complaining of the bad effects of an immoderate use of wine, says, "For I myself am of those who were yesterday *overwhelmed* (baptized)." We surely do not speak of men being sprinkled or poured into, or with intoxication and sleep; we say, as the Greeks said, that men are plunged into or overwhelmed with, intoxication and sleep. Such are the uses of baptizo by this Jewish Hellenistic writer of the days of the Apostles. Not a single passage here where the word is not clear and distinct in its *one*, perpetual meaning of *immerse, plunge.* No ingenuity can obscure these passages to the candid, though the simplest, mind. And this is Hellenistic Greek, immediately in all respects as to time, author, country, alongside of the New Testament Greek. The force of this testimony is as complete as evidence possibly can be; men could not construct, for the special purpose, anything stronger. We have shown also that Hellenistic usage here does not differ from Classic usage.

Philo of Alexandria was also a Jew, and a man of great learning, strongly imbued with Greek Philosophy. He was a very prolific writer on religious and philosophical subjects, and wrote in the Greek language, using the then 'common' or 'Hellenistic' dialect. He lived in the middle of the first century after Christ, and therefore is in every respect, a full respresentative of the Greek language in the days of the New Testament authors. His use of the word baptizo is very definite and clear. In one passage, preserved by Eusebius, he says, "And one might show it also from this, that those who live soberly and content with little, excel in understanding; but those on the contrary, who are always glutted with drink and food, are least intelligent, as though the reason were *whelmed* (baptized) *by the things overlying*

Digitized by Google

it." This is certainly clear; it is needless to develop the meaning of the word here,—"the reason is baptized by the things overlying it." So again in his *Contemplation of Life, (Mangey*, vol. ii. p. 478),—"And I know some, who when they become slightly intoxicated, before they are completely *overwhelmed* (baptized) &c., &c." The same use as above in Josephus. Of course to be *completely baptized* (teleos baptisthenai) in wine and intoxication, is neither to be completely sprinkled or poured,—words without sense in such a place, but to be completely *plunged* or *drenched*, as expressed by words with this meaning in all languages. It would certainly be a hard task for the pedobaptists, who seek for sprinkling and pouring in baptizo in Hellenistic Greek, to get such meanings out of the passages we have here quoted,—(and we have quoted, we believe, all in which the word occurs) from these two Jewish Hellenistic writers of the New Testament period; it would certainly be curious to see them attempt the task!

EARLY GREEK VERSIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Early in the history of the Christian church, Greek translations were made of the Old Testament. These were made, of course, in the Greek of that day, the Hellenistic diction, especially as spoken and written by Jews and Christians, and represents in the fullest form the dialect under examination.

The Version of Aquila, a Jew,—once a Christian, was made in the first half of the second century after Christ. His translation of the Old Testament was made for the use of his Jewish brethren in their controversies with the Christians. For this reason it was a *strictly literal one*, aiming at the closest possible exact representation of the original Hebrew in the Greek.* Job ix. 31, our common English translation renders, "Yet thou shalt *plunge* me in the ditch, and my own clothes shall abhor me"—that is, "make me to be ashamed"—from their being covered with filth. The Hebrew word for *plunge* here is *taval*, the same as in the case of *Naaman*, 2 Ks. v. 11, where it is translated *dip*,—a word that never means anything else but *dip* or *immerse*, as given in our article of last month,—which see. This passage Aquila translates thus, "Even then thou wilt *baptize* me in corruption"; in Hebrew *taval*, in the common English *plunge*, in Aquila *baptizo*.—

* See Herzog's Encyclopædie,—Article, *Bibelebuersetzungen*,—'Bible translations.'

Digitized by Google

This shows the meaning of baptizo in the days of Aquila,—that is, in the Hellenistic Greek of the apostolic age.

The Version of Symmachus was made about the last half of the second century after Christ. Symmachus was a learned Samaritan, but went over to the Jews, and for their benefit made a new translation of the Old Testament into Greek. This version was of high merit, and also, of course, represents fully the Hellenistic or common dialect,—and more particularly as spoken and written by the Palestine Jews,—the Greek as we find it in the New Testament. If a change in *baptizo* took place from the ancient classic Greek, in the Hellenistic dialect of the days of Christ and the apostles,—certainly the change would have been no less in the days of Symmachus. In his translation he gives Ps. 69: 2, "I am *baptized* into bottomless depths," *ebaptisthen eis aperantous kataduseis*; in our common version this reads, "I *sink* in deep mire."

These quotations from the Greek versions of the Old Testament made after Christ, show distinctly what the meaning of *baptizo* was in the Hellenistic diction,—that it meant simply to plunge and immerse,—and not to sprinkle or pour. These two latter meanings are utterly irreconcilable with the occurrences of this word in the places cited.

We shall next refer to the Christian Greek writers,—called the Greek Fathers. C. L. L.

It lightens the stroke to draw near to Him who handles the rod.

The writer does the most who gives his reader the most knowledge, and takes from him the least time.

Dr. Johnson was wont to say that a habit of looking at the best side of every event is far better than a thousand pounds a year.

The closet is a nursery for piety; and wherever there is a declension in its duties, there will be a declension of religion in the heart.—*J. R. Bond.*

A hidden light soon becomes dim, and if it be entirely covered up, will expire for want of air. So it is with hidden religion. It must go out. There cannot be a Christian whose light in some aspects does not shine.

Digitized by Google

From the British Quarterly Review.

THE PLACE WHERE LIGHT DWELLETH.

The central idea of modern science is force. Of this force it is supposed there is a certain quantity in the universe which can neither be physically lessened nor increased. It may be passive, like the slumbering electricity in an unexcited body, in which case it is called potential energy; or it may waken up into resistless activity, like the same element in an exploding thunderbolt, and then it is known (perhaps felt) as actual or dynamic energy. All the forms of force are said to be related, and all admit of mutual conversion; but whatever character they assume, and whether kept in daily circulation or buried in some subterranean storehouse for ages, the sum-total of power is alleged to remain precisely and unchangeably the same. It is a something which He only who created can diminish or destroy.

For us, in this planet, the sun is the chief fountain of force. The mechanical labor alone which our luminary performs in the world is prodigious, and his agency in some of the commonest transactions is popularly unsuspected. Ask a rustic miller what turns his watermill, and he would regard it as a pure mockery were he told that it was the sun. It is certainly the stream which drives the wheel, and as certainly it is the earth's gravity which draws the fluid down to the lowest level it can find. But what lifted that fluid to the heights from which it has so noisily descended? Clearly the bright but distant orb, without which there would be no rain to fill the channel and no moisture to feed the springs.

And what works that windmill whose sails are circling so merrily on the neighboring hill? There again we have the same great agent employed—stronger than the strongest giant, meeker than the humblest turnspit; for it is he who sets the air in motion, and refreshes the earth with zephyrs, or purifies it with the storm and tempest. But surely, it might be said, the horse which drags yonder heavy load, and the locomotive which transports yonder heavier train, accomplish their tasks, the one by virtue of its muscles, the other by virtue of its steam, and this without the slightest help from your puissant sun? Do they? Not a morsel of duty could they perform had he not given them the means!—For without him there could have been no vegetable life to sup-

Digitized by Google

ply the animal with food, or to replenish its iron substitute with fuel. It is to the sun, too, that we ourselves owe the power of performing the simplest physical acts, for it is he who is our helper if we shake a friend by the hand, and our accomplice if we knock an adversary down. In fact, trace matters back sufficiently far—a few steps will generally be enough—and we shall discover that all mechanical activity must, in some way or other, be ascribed to the influence or intervention of this *ministro maggior della natura*, as Dante calls the sun. The very tides which appear to be so emphatically under the sway of the moon, are no exception to this law; for how could the seas respond to the lunar solicitations if they were converted into solid masses of ice, as they would infallibly be by the extinction of his rays?* Considering, indeed, how all animal and vegetable existence is dependent upon the solar emanations, Professor Tyndall is abundantly justified in his assertion that "we are not only in a poetical sense, but in a mechanical sense, the children of the sun."

From this orb there stream down upon us three distinct forms of influence—the luminous, the calorific, the chemical. How light develops force, how it sets bodies to work at its bidding, may be seen in its action on plants. A laurel leaf introduced into a receiver of carbonic acid and hydrogen, as Boussingault shows, produces no effect whilst kept in perfect darkness; take it into sunshine, and that leaf becomes inspired with energy; it tears the elements of the acid asunder, appropriates the carbon to its use, and is prepared to deliver up the oxygen for the general purposes of creation. So long as a vegetable is retained in profound obscurity its leaves appear to be asleep; they can only exhale—we had almost said, dream out—carbonic acid; and it is not until placed under the stimulus of light that they become sensitive, and wake up to do their appointed work.

How the chemical rays excite molecular action may be briefly indicated by referring to their effect upon a mixture of chlorine and hydrogen. Kept for a time in darkness, these two gases, though eager to combine and form hydrochloric acid, remain si-

* Perhaps volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, and the energies derived from the internal heat of the globe may seem to be purely domestic transactions; but it is impossible to say how far that very heat may not have been a legacy from the sun, or our share of the great solar inheritance when the earth entered upon its planetary career.

Digitized by Google

lent and insulated; but turn on a current of sunshine, and in a moment or two an explosion ensues, and the union is effected with such violence that the vessel may be shattered to fragments. By way of estimating the sun's chemical power, Bunsen and Roscoe calculated that if our earth were surrounded by an atmosphere of these two gases, to the depth of about thirty-eight yards, the letting in of his light fully for a single minute would convert the whole into an ocean of hydrochloric acid.

But it is the sun's heat which will afford us the readiest and most familiar illustration of force, His issue of caloric has been variously represented. According to Sir J. Herschel, it would melt a pillar of ice 1,590 square miles at its base and 194,626 miles in height in one second of time. According to Pouillet, it would liquefy a shell of ice ten and a half miles thick in a single day, though it encompassed the entire orb. According to Professor Tyndall, it is equal to the heat which would be yielded by a seam of coal sixteen and a half miles in depth were it fired and reduced to ashes. Large figures are generally very bewildering, and when M. Guillemin * expresses the sun's deliveries of caloric by a row of twenty-five ciphers preceded by 4,847, the effect upon the imagination is benumbing rather than exciting.

But the matter may be put in a more simple and accessible form. Calculating the caloric yielded by each square foot of the sun's surface every hour, as equivalent to that which would be given out by the combustion of 1,500 lbs. of coal, this would accomplish the work of 7,000 horses. There is something overpowering in this conception when we consider that it applies to the entire superficies of an enormous globe of more than 880,000 miles in diameter, and not to a few selected spots. We may have here and there on our own planet steam engines doing the work of innumerable quadrupeds, but the idea of several thousands clustered—concentrated, we may say—on each square foot of the sun's area, and exerting their energies incessantly, is one which we cannot compass with much sense of success.

* M. Guillemin's work on the sun is one of those agreeable productions which take off all stiffness from scientific topics, and put matters in so popular a form that no reader need wrinkle his brows in the vain effort to understand what the writer means, or what the facts imply. It is copiously illustrated, and is inspired with French vivacity from first to last. (Published by Scribner & Co., New York.)

Digitized by Google

Let us, however, transfer the question of solar power to the surface of the earth. Our globe, of course, intercepts but a fractional part of these burning emanations—only about one-two-hundred-and-fifteen-millionth of the whole, according to Herschel. But, relatively small, they are intrinsically enormous, for M. Guillemin observes that the quantity poured upon a single hectare of ground (2.47 acres) develops, under a thousand various forms, as much force as is equivalent to the continued labor of 4,163 horses. The vast amount of work our luminary could, therefore, execute as a mechanical agent by means of his rays, even in the diffuse condition in which they reach this planet, has not failed to attract the attention of curious inquirers. Indeed, we might say that the waste of valuable sunshine which might do the duty of all the steam engines in the world, has excited the displeasure (wrath might be a better word) of more than one scientific economist. There are people who will always be indignant that Niagara cannot be employed to turn mills for grinding our corn, and Vesuvius converted into a forge to melt metal on the most stupendous scale. We plead guilty to a touch of the same temper. But, without indulging in philosophical covetousness, is it not distressing to know that the beams which play so unprofitably, in some respects, on many parts of our earth, might, if properly impounded and harnessed to cunningly-constructed machines, be compelled to serve mankind in a very useful and lucrative capacity?

So, at least, thinks Monsieur Mouchot.

On a fine day, at Paris, it was found that the sun's rays, playing upon a surface of one square meter (1.196 yards) communicated as much heat every minute as would suffice to raise at least one litre (1.76 pints) of ice-cold water to the boiling point. In other words, says our Frenchman, its effect was nearly equal to the theoretical duty of a single horse-power steam engine. There are places, however, on our globe where the sky is clearer, the soil more arid, and where, consequently, the Lord of Day is known to stalk in burning splendor. Could not some of his radiance be captured by means of what M. Mouchot calls solar receivers? He announces that he has taken some practical steps towards the solution of this question. So far back as 1861 he showed the possibility of working a hot-air engine by the instrumentality of the sun's rays. Subsequently, having ascertained

Digitized by Google

that he could generate seventeen litres of vapor in a minute by the use of a silver reflector, he attempted to drive a small steam-engine by the agency of arrested sunshine. In 1866 he succeeded. Since, however, his experiments were made upon a restricted scale, this ingenious Frenchman recommends that they should be repeated in tropical countries, and with receivers of more magnificent dimensions. In his enthusiasm he even indulges the hope that some day the invention will be transferred to the deserts, where industry will settle down, and establish important works for the sake of the superior sunshine which those glowing tracts afford. Who will not sympathize with M. Mouchot on learning that, according to his experiments, it would be practicable to collect, in an inexpensive way, fully three-fifths of the solar heat which falls upon our earth? Is it not a matter for many groans, that whilst the sum of the sun's influence upon our planet has been computed as equivalent to the labor of 217,316,000,000,000 horses toiling day and night, not a single patent, so far as we know, has been taken out for an engine to be directly worked by sunbeams. Ours is certainly a wasteful world. A large portion of the warmth we might extract from our coal goes idly up our chimneys; and it seems that the cheaper caloric which is sent us from our luminary is allowed to float back into space without driving (by its immediate action) so much as a coffee-mill, or performing any artificial mechanical duty for mankind.

Whence, however, proceeds the heat which the sun thus prodigally emits. In our own planet, combustion—that is to say, chemical combination—is the chief source of native caloric. But if a similar process were in progress on the central orb, it must sooner or later come to a conclusion; and though we cannot read the history of the sun at large, yet it is in our power to grope backward, and judge whether such an operation can have been in force during his registered existence. Now, Prof. W. Thomson says that the "chemical theory is quite insufficient, because the most energetic chemical action we know, taking place between substances amounting to the whole sun's mass, would only generate about 3,000 years' heat." If, therefore, our luminary had been dependent upon his own treasures of inflammable material, he must have been a dead, dark mass when Adam left Paradise, and could have had no visible existence when Joshua is reported to have held him spell-bound for a whole day upon Gibeon. And

Digitized by Google

during those three thousand years his energies must have varied not only sensibly, but seriously; for, however well "coaled" the orb might be when his career as the giver of life commenced, yet, self-sustained, it is impossible to believe that he could have preserved the same steady glow throughout the whole period of human existence. Professor Tyndall computed that if the sun had been a great block of coal, supplied with as much oxygen as would enable him to uphold the existing rate of radiation, the whole of his substance would have been consumed in 5,000 years.—Kindled at the birth of Adam, his very embers would now have ceased to gleam.

We must, therefore, have recourse to some more efficient theory than that of simple combustion. That the luminary shines by virtue of some mysterious property of his own, is as inadmissible as the idea of those perpetual lamps, fed by their own unrenewed fuel, which are said to have been found in ancient sepulchers, but of which no specimen is to be seen in any modern cemetery or antiquarian cabinet. Perhaps the most inviting hypothesis is the meteoric.

There is manifestly a prodigious quantity of spare matter in the universe. We will not call it waste matter—the refuse left by the Creator when the work of world-making was completed, as Dr. Whewell suggested—but round the sun, and probably round the earth, and possibly round each planet,* small bodies are continually revolving. These are, of course, too diminutive to be ranked as satellites; but occasionally some of them are seen flashing through the air, whilst others, though more rarely, are overpowered by the earth's gravity and dragged to the ground. Looking up at the sky on any clear evening, it would be strange if the eye did not catch a glance of some meteor suddenly kindled and as suddenly extinguished. On certain nights in August and November—classical nights for the astronomers—thousands of these splendid objects have been counted. It was computed, from observations at Boston (U. S.), that on one occasion not less than 240,000 swept through the atmosphere in the course of nine hours; and there are few persons in this country who will not remember the magnificent display in 1866, when our planet seemed to be undergoing bombardment from some rival orb, and the shells fell in showers through the air—harmlessly, thank heaven!—for

* Saturn's rings may be thus constituted.

Digitized by Google

if the skyey artillery had been pointed direct at our globe, instead of hurling its missiles over our heads, what a battered appearance the poor earth might have presented when the combat was concluded and the foe had retired!

Now, when one of these vagrant masses alights upon our globe it is found to be in so highly heated a condition that it cannot be handled; or should it remain undiscovered for months or years, we know from the signs of superficial fusion, though its substance consists of stone or iron, that a vast quantity of caloric must have been developed during its transit through the air. Mr. Symonds, who witnessed the fall of a mass of meteoric iron in 1844, in a pass near the river Macorita, in South America, went immediately to the spot, but could not approach nearer than ten or twelve yards on account of the heat; the soil was bubbling up around it for the same reason, and the *piedra de fierro*, so far as it was not imbedded in the ground, was glowing intensely.

This caloric cannot come, to any extent at least, from combustion, for we might as well expect a cannon-ball to burst into a blaze as a lump of meteoric iron; nor can it have been imported from abroad by the body itself, as might have been the case if aerolites had been ejected from lunar volcanoes, in conformity with Laplace's view. Obviously the elevated temperature of these objects is due to the friction encountered in the atmosphere, and to the concussion sustained by the fall. Can we doubt, then, that the impact of such masses, showered into the sun by millions—all their arrested motion converted into heat—would feed the solar furnace to some notable extent?

Nor will it be deemed a fact without significance that the elements discovered in the sun are correspondent in character with those discovered in meteoric stones. In other words, on applying the spectroscope to the solar atmosphere, no substance can be detected there which may not be found in the lumps of fuel dropped by the way, and left with us as if for the very purpose of analysis. The singular prominence of the iron lines in the spectrum cannot fail to prove suggestive when we remember that the same metal forms the chief constituent of many of the masses which have fallen from our sky, though, as M. Meunier says, it is more characteristic of ancient than of modern descents.—Nickel, cobalt, copper, zinc, sodium, potassium, calcium, aluminum, hydrogen, and other elements which have already revealed

Digitized by Google

themselves in the sun, are common components of these captured ramblers.

It is true that meteorites exhibit still more numerous points of concurrence with the materials of our globe, for about thirty of our elementary bodies have been traced in them on the one hand, whilst, on the other, no purely foreign substance has yet been detected; but the discoveries in the solar world are by no means completed, and the community of matter which has recently been established suggests that there may have been in ancient days, as there may be in future times, something more than a casual connection between the wandering masses of space and the great orb whose gravity governs the whole system.

Let it be observed, however, in reference to this theory, that it does not involve the idea of combustion in the ordinary sense.—It is not coal, or coke, or other inflammable material which is supposed to be carted off to the sun. The meteors produce heat chiefly by their concussion. Doubtless, there are many persons to whom this will appear a very unsatisfactory source of caloric. A smith may hammer a piece of iron till it becomes red-hot, but how many Cyclops would be required to keep a whole anvil glowing from day to day? Yet, if we take a few calculations as proximately correct, it will be seen what prodigious results may arise from the simple arrest of motion. It was computed by Mayer, the great patron of the theory, that a cosmical fragment hurling itself upon the central orb at a speed of from 445,750 to 630,400 metres per second, would produce from 4,600 to 9,200 times more heat by its simple shock, than a similar quantity of coal would by its combustion. One of our eminent physicists asserts, that if the earth were suddenly halted in its course, and allowed to descend by its gravity to the sun, the caloric generated by the blow would be equal to that developed by the combustion of 5,600 worlds of solid carbon. Professor W. Thomson estimated the effect which most of the planets would produce if they were similarly flung upon the parent orb. Whilst the shock occasioned by the precipitation of our earth in a direct line would of itself maintain the sun's present issues of heat for nearly 100 years, Mars, by his concussion, would afford a supply for about twelve and three-quarter years. Little Mercury, short as is the distance he would tumble, would represent something more than a few scuttles full of fuel cast upon the central fire, for he would be able to keep it

Digitized by Google

alive for about six and a half years. If Saturn, though light as cork, were to "shoot madly" from his sphere, the terrible momentum he would acquire during his descent would contribute 9,650 years of heat; whilst Jupiter, with his heavier mass, would charge the solar furnace with caloric to the extent of its capacity for upwards of 322 centuries. Thus the eight planets of our system (to say nothing of their satellites, or of the mob of asteroids,) would, if perpendicularly projected upon the sun, engender heat sufficient to enable it to preserve its present status among the stars for nearly fifty thousand years.

But is there adequate foundation for this hypothesis? It is a captivating speculation, for it has the merit of pointing out an accessible supply of fuel, (using that word in its scientific, and not in its conventional sense) and at the same time of converting the very lumber of creation, as it might be excusably deemed, into the most useful and important item in the cosmical economy.—The theory is one also which sweeps shoals of comets into its net, and of these bodies, as Kepler observed, there are more in space than there are fishes in the sea. "Alle diese Massen," says Mayer, "sturtzen mit einem heftigen Stosse in ihr gemeinsames Grab:"—"All these masses," says Mayer, "plunge with a violent shock into their common grave." It provides also a kind of self-acting machinery, by which this fuel is brought to the sun's doors, and flung into the flames without any other agency—we had almost said without any other "stoker"—than gravity itself. Seeing how necessary it is for the planetary household that the solar caloric should be carefully maintained, could a more valuable function be assigned to such matter than that of keeping up the great focal fires, especially if it be the wreck of shattered globes, or the sweepings of the system which might otherwise have been consigned to the dust-bin of creation, or allowed to litter the heavens in revolving heaps.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

Good actions sown in our pathway, bud and blossom to embalm our remembrance at some later day.

The intercession of Christ is as a wall of fire around his people; they are kept as by an impregnable garrison.—*Hervey.*

Digitized by Google

LETTERS FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

LETTER VIII.

ANASTASIS—NEW TESTAMENT.

I. The Professor begins very properly with the resurrection of Christ. He grants that the same body which arose, likewise ascended; but contends that it was not a material body. The evidence to the contrary is surely abundant. "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." The print of the nails remained, and the appointed witnesses did eat and drink with him after he was raised from the dead. Bush gets on evil ground in meeting evidence of this kind; he sees a 'miraculous adaptation of the visible phenomena to the outward senses of the disciples': 'This eating was doubtless an *optical* act.' As we have got into the region of deception and semblances,—of appearance and phantasmagoria, the whole of the Christian verities may be dissipated into shadow and unreality by similar enchantment. Birth, baptism, miracles and crucifixion,—only the shifting scenery of a dream, without any objective historic reality. The circumstances connected with the risen Lord may indicate some difference in the body—an increase of freedom and power. But the circumstances have been too much made of. He who fasted forty days, and creative, multiplied the loaves and fishes; he who walked upon the sea, and stood on the pinnacle of the temple; he who burned out in essential splendor on the Mount and called the dead back into life,—did all this before his death; and surely, after his resurrection a few miraculous circumstances don't involve the presence of a phantom.

The Professor thinks that the body which hung upon the cross was miraculously resolved into its primitive elements, like that of Elijah when he was translated; but this is outrage against both Testaments, and both personages. In the case of Elijah, there was neither death nor burial. It was the *mantle* of the ascending Prophet which fell down, not his body, or else Elisha would have been in considerable danger.

He admits that the disciples supposed that the body which they saw was the veritable body of their crucified Lord, and that in their preaching the resurrection of Jesus, they had no other idea

Digitized by Google

than that of the reanimation of his body of flesh. It is clear that the angels had the same faith as the disciples: for when the latter were perplexed in not finding the body, their answer was, 'He is not here, but is risen.' According to Bush there was no resurrection, but God removed the body to deceive the apostles; and then, in the ardor of the new conviction, they palmed the imposture on the world. Excellent moral men like the professor, have no conception of the enormous evil which they accomplish.—From the quiet cabinet they send forth diseased, disjointed speculations, which perchance have done themselves little harm, being counterbalanced by high culture and strict moral training; but in a very short time the speculative falsehoods get among men who have neither culture nor reverence, and are transmuted into coarse blasphemies for the tavern and the market place.

II. 1 Cor. xv. Here the professor argues first,—that the resurrection spoken of, is exclusively that of the righteous; but why insist on this when he denies all resurrection. Assuming that it is only the resurrection of the righteous, still, if it be reality, it cuts up by the roots the theory which he advocates. If resurrection be as Bush contends, "the elimination of a spiritual body at death," the process belongs to the *ages*, and the passages which describe the righteous arising *en masse*, are as hard for him to expound as though they included the resurrection of the wicked.

The passage before us no doubt troubled the professor, for Paul teaches that Christ died for our sins, that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.—Whereas according to the theory of Bush the ethereal body emerges from the physical body at death; hence the Lord must have risen before he was buried. The truth is, that the inspired man of God is in the midst of solemn reality, and he talks verities in a masculine manner, and gives them in right relation; whereas the modern sophist is in the midst of shadows and phantasms, and has a scheme of false philosophy to support which leads him to torture every passage of holy writ, that all may become spectral and insubstantial. He cannot see how the future resurrection of the saints is proved by the past resurrection of Christ, or how the past resurrection of Christ is proved by the future resurrection of his people, but thinks that if resurrection takes place

Digitized by Google

with every individual believer *as soon* as he leaves the body, Paul is saved from bad logic, from reasoning in a circle. In truth the Professor does not understand the question. Even among those who were saying that there would be no resurrection of the dead, the resurrection of Christ was an admitted fact. Indeed it was the Reality of realities—proving that God had accepted the work of Jesus, and leading the path from the grave to reconstruction and immortality. Good men are sometimes bad logicians. The Corinthian speculators were wrong in saying that there was no resurrection,—inconsistent as well as wrong,—for they were awakened into earnestness and life by hearing that God had raised a dead man and proclaimed through him forgiveness and eternal life. And further, as the resurrection was the pledge or assurance that all his people would arise, they were forgetting the consequence as well as the foundation.

The Apostle was a much better logician than the Professor, though he might not spend so much time in 'naming his tools.' It is clear enough that if there be no resurrection, Christ is not raised. But if Christ be raised, the necessary consequences are sublime and far-reaching—wonderful in relation to the character of God and the destinies of man.

Bush comments like an infidel on the 18 v.; he asks how those asleep in Christ are perished if there be no resurrection, and says, "their souls, the true constituent of themselves, were certainly in being, and what should prevent their souls being saved, even if their bodies did not rise?" With all his pretensions and talk about modern science and philosophy, the Professor seems to be quite unconscious of the tripartite nature of man; and yet man is a being composed of body, soul, and spirit—Revelation being in harmony with the finest intuition of the highest reason. But there can be no salvation for man which does not comprehend his entire complex nature. The Apostle knew well what he was writing about. The resurrection of Christ was God putting His mark and seal to the 'finished work of Christ.' If there be no resurrection, then we have a *dead Christ*; and if Christ be a dead Christ, the apostles have proclaimed a lie as the truth of God, and you the receivers of the Gospel have believed the lie; by consequence, your sins have not been blotted out, your hope a delusion, your worship a superstition, and the dead in Christ are perished,—for a dead man cannot give them life; body, soul and

Digitized by Google

spirit are all raised together, if the Lord Christ be not the risen one. To dream that *one* element of humanity might survive through eternity, and the remainder perish, has no more hold on philosophy than on divinity.

The Professor confesses a difficulty; "We have encountered a great difficulty in view of our previous position that the true resurrection takes place at the death of every individual believer, when he emerges from a material into a spiritual body." Is it not clearly implied, not to say expressly asserted, that the resurrection of all the righteous is simultaneous, and that this event is still future, to occur at the epoch of the Second Advent, and, in conjunction with the translation of the living saints. But in the room of bowing before the majesty of truth, he begins to sing the old song—"if our previous reasoning be sound, this passage cannot be in conflict"!—happy reasoner! But this not all,—he finds another way out. He discovers that Paul either declared more than what was revealed, or was mistaken as to the exact purport of what was revealed; in short, concludes with John P. Robinson, that "they didn't know everything down in Judea."

III. Matt. xxii. 31. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." This, the Professor argues, proves only that the Patriarchs were alive when God declared himself their God. I am no materialist, as is well known, yet I deny utterly that the Lord had anything before him save the resurrrection of the dead. The Sadducees were not inquiring about any intermediate state, or the possible marriage of disembodied souls, but inquiring about what would happen in the resurrection. It is to the resurrection that our Lord directs his remarks. The spirit of his reply is simply this,—The fundamental relationship between God and the Patriarchs is still a reality. Though dead according to the constitution of nature, they are living in the firm counsel and purpose of God. The covenant he made with them was an everlasting one, and he will break the slumber of the grave, and fulfill every provision.

IV. Matt. xxvii. 50–59. "And the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and ap-

Digitized by Google

peared unto many." This is such a powerful contrast to the 'elimination of an ethereal body at death,' that our Professor knows not what to do with it. His 'extremities of solution' reach a climax. It appears from his statement that these bodies "disappeared immediately upon what is termed their rising, and were seen no more; for the supposition is to us utterly *incredible* that these material bodies were the objects *beheld* by those to whom the appearance was made." "It was in the main an invisible resurrection of the saints." "The design was to put forth to the sense of men a visible effect of what was going on in the spiritual world." "We don't suppose that strictly speaking the dead now first arise." We need Œdipus back, or Pantagruel, for he found his way into the heart of a cause which had baffled councillors, Doctors and Rabbinists, who had tried in vain to get their teeth into it for six and forty weeks. Excepting in the speeches of the two lords who pleaded before him, as may be seen in Rabelais, I remember nothing equal to this.

It appears that the bodies arose, but did not then *first* arise.

That they were *seen*, but never seen again—seen *no more*.

That they were *never* seen—the thing being *incredible* (as apparitions could be easier seen than material bodies).

That it was in the *main* an invisible resurrection (the *visible* part being the resurrection of apparitions who never died, the invisible, that of solid bodies, persons who died). But it was mainly invisible [the awaking of spectres who never fell asleep].

But after all there was a *visible* effect (whatever that may mean) of what was going on in the invisible world.

Dismissing the smile, we say to the sophist, 'Sir, if you had been pleading any cause of God and truth, you never would have been allowed to sink down into such wretched contradiction and wrangling. God would have given you seeing eyes, and you never would have been lost in such a jungle.'

V. John v: "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming in the whch all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." "This," says Bush, "is the strongest passage in the New Testament in favor of the common resurrection, and we cannot fail to perceive that it is marked by a certain directness of enunciation in respect to the general subject which must be considered as strongly countenancing the common construction which the Christian world has ever for the most part been led to

Digitized by Google

put upon it." How then does the Professor meet it? First, by going back again to all the passages which treat of the resurrection of privilege and glory, which we have already commented upon, and conveniently ignoring the fact that a resurrection of damnation is likewise in the passage; second, by pleading the *weight* of his rational and philosophical evidence against any actual resurrection,—which we have already seen is as *heavy* as thistle-down; third, by referring again to his 'accommodation theory,' which takes away all absolute truth from the teaching of our Lord, and would render him guilty of contemptible subserviency to popular ignorance and prejudices. In one attempt which he makes to prove his theory he fails deplorably. "If I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out?" this Bush regards as a clear proof of 'accommodation.' I do not. There is a specific case on record of one who was actually casting out devils, though he was not following the Lord—and the Lord recognized the fact that true miracles might be done in *his name* by others beside his immediate band, and such workers were not to be forbidden.

VI. Acts ii. 29–35. Here Bush reasons that David is not exalted as Christ is. But this is evasion. If the theory be true that the elimination of the ethereal body at death is the resurrection, then to plead that David's sepulcher was with them, was no proof that he was not ascended; hence a literal resurrection is by necessity demanded on behalf of Christ, and denied so far as David is concerned. One sitteth at the right hand of God, who liveth, and was dead; the other lies in the sepulcher waiting the sound of the trumpet.

VII. Acts xxiv—"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope towards God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." Here the worthy Professor has two inquiries; first, he wants to know what authority Paul had for crediting the Pharisees with such knowledge; and second, how the passage may be construed in consistency with what he assumes to be the doctrine. On the first point we may say that the man who was trained at the feet of Gamaliel, was as likely as Bush to know what was believed by his brethren in the school of the flesh;

Digitized by Google

but we have no intention of seriously inquiring into his authority. On the second point, we remark, that no construing will bring the passage into harmony with the foolish dreaming of Bush and Swedenborg. The Professor is sometimes simple against himself. Here is a passage which he quotes from Justin Martyr to show that there were some persons in the early Christian days who came '*very near*' to his own views. It does not seem to trouble him that the eminent saint who is quoted considered his friends heretical blasphemers, unworthy of the name of Christians: "If you have met with certain persons called Christians, who do not confess this, but have the boldness to blaspheme the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, and who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that immediately on death the soul is received up into heaven, do not consider them as Christians, any more than you would give the name of Jews to the Sadducees, and other heretical sects.....However as many as are altogether orthodox, believe that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a millennium in Jerusalem restored, adorned and enlarged, according to the predictions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophets." *

VIII. Rom. viii. 10, 11—"But if the Spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead, shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit that dwelleth in you." To the argument founded on this, Bush answers, first, that literal resurrection is not elsewhere attributed to the Spirit; second, that mortal only means, tending to death. This is all blundering. Christ was declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead. He was put to death in the flesh but quickened by the Spirit; God manifest in flesh, was justified in the Spirit when his resurrection disproved the grounds on which he was condemned and slain. The whole house of Israel are to be brought out of their graves by God putting His Spirit into them that they may live. The two slain witnesses are to be raised by the Spirit of life from God entering into them. As to *mortal*, the Apostle did not mean that our bodies will be raised before they die, but that the mortal tabernacles in which we now live will be —after death—restored again by the Holy Spirit. I am far from

* Dialogue with Trypho.

Digitized by Google

denying that there is a transformation already proceeding. In fact I think it glorious; and it has often struck me as a strong collateral proof that the veritable body must rise again. Here is a man whose body is a temple in which God dwells through the Holy Spirit;—the limbs, functions, capabilities are all moved in the pursuit of sanctity and righteousness, all delivered from mere animal tendencies, and rendered swift and supple in the endeavor after holiness, and fullness of spiritual life. It would be monstrous, if—as some suppose—this temple of the Holy Spirit should be shattered and lost forever. The individual spirit would not find itself *at home* in any new creation, but would pine for that proper essential organism, in which all the moral history of spirit and soul were written, where life and love grew together and spiritual change advanced in fine stages, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord.

IX. Rom. viii. 23. "And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves, groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." Bush reasons that the word body signifies here the collective body of the saints—one redeemed, regenerate, sanctified body, whose hope is consummated, or else he thinks that the Apostle would not have spoken in the singlular number, but would have said our *bodies*. I have no objection to this, but find no argument in it, for you cannnot have the 'collective body' without the inclusion of its individual constituents; and when the church of the first-born has manifestation—the inward glory of regeneration, shining outwardly in revelation of power and splendor,—it can only be by all the members of the body standing up in resurrection life.

X. Mark xiv. 58. On this the Professor says, "As our Savior said in speaking of his resurrection, 'I will destroy this temple that is made *with hands*, and in three days I will build another made *without hands*,' which must certainly refer to his spiritual body in contradistinction to his natural."

This is the first sign of grace. The Professor has reached a passage which he is willing to accept as it stands, without any violence. No critical screws, or racks, to be applied. How sad that we are compelled to spoil a fine picture. But the necessity of truth compels us to take the passage from him. The Professor has, in fact, not quoted from the Lord, but from the *false witnes-*

Digitized by Google

ses; "and there arose certain and bare false witness against him, saying, 'We have heard him say I will destroy this temple that is made with hands, and within three days I will build another made without hands'—but neither so did their witness agree together." The words actually employed by our Lord are to be found in John ii. 19, "Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up,"—not, as the false witnesses said, *another* temple, but THIS—the one destroyed, raised up, re-edified. "He spake of the temple of his body." If we could get from the Professor a document explaining in what sense the natural body of our Lord was made *with* hands, and in what sense his spiritual body was made *without* hands, the production would have extraordinary interest of the sensational order. But as he confounded the men of perjury with the spotless Lord, we shall perhaps hear nothing further of the matter.

G. GREENWELL.

LIVERPOOL, ENG.

"TUNING UP."

Some time since *Punch* had the following, illustrative of the use of musical performances in church:

"The Rev. Mr. Bland (who has come to perform the duty for an absent friend, at a small country church,) says to the Clerk: 'I suppose a hymn is sung in the same simple manner.'

"*Clerk.*—'Oh dear, no, sir; we have a very efficient choir of singers, besides three violins, three flutes, a clarionet, accordeon, horn, and my base fiddle; and we sing four hymns, besides chanting the Psalms and Litany; we know Mozart's 'Twelfth Service,' and to-day we perform Purcell's 'Te Deum' and 'Jubilate,' besides our usual anthem, and, sir, you need not trouble yourself to read the Belief, for we sing that, too; and, sir, would you prefer our tuning up for the last piece during your Exordium, or at the Blessing? for my base fiddle will drop half a note during the service, and,'—

"The Rev. Dr. Bland turns pale, and asks for a glass of water!"

The flowers of rhetoric are only acceptable when backed by the evergreens of truth and sense.

Digitized by Google

SPANISH SCRIPTURES.

CIRCULAR FROM THE AMERICAN BIBLE UNION.

To every one who loves the Lord Jesus Christ and His precious Word:

Dear Brother, Dear Sister:—We have interesting intelligence to communicate. The Lord is working wonders on behalf of his truth, in view of which our hearts swell with gratitude and joyful anticipation. A few facts and incidents, hastily thrown together, and briefly described, will enable you to sympathize in our delight.

Origin of our Spanish Testament.—When the Bible Union was organized, nothing was farther from our minds than at that time to commence the revision of the Spanish Testament. But God so directed us, in his providence, that our duty in this respect did not admit of a doubt. Ministers and colporteurs, using and distributing Spanish translations of the word of God, had become utterly dissatisfied with all then existing. One who had spent some twelve years in disseminating the issues of Bible Societies, both English and American, in South America, at last abandoned the field, went back to Great Britain, and organized a body of benevolent men to revise the Spanish Testament. They united with the missionary projector of the work, Rev. Frederick Crowe, in requesting us to undertake it.

After suitable consideration, we engaged in it. Spanish scholars of the highest character for learning, discretion, and piety, were employed by us. The chief translator, Don Juan Calderon, died in the fifth year of the enterprise, when it was little more than half completed. His extraordinary qualifications and high reputation inspired the greatest doubts whether a suitable successor could be engaged.

In answer to fervent and continuous prayer, the Lord sent us a man, not only his equal in qualification, but in official position even his superior. Our noble and self-sacrificing agent, Rev. Wm. Norton, who had charge of the work, wrote to us from London, under date of November 4, 1854, to this effect:

"Our friend of the Royal Academy has at length examined, at my request, the whole of the translation executed by Mr. Calderon. The alterations which he has made, as to translation, are few; the actual errors discovered are very few; but he has made

Digitized by Google

a considerable number of changes on the *accents*. These **do not** change the sense, but only conform the work on this point to the most recent decisions of the Royal Academy."

In the course of years, the book was finished at a cost of many thousands of dollars.

Valuable Testimony.—While the work was in progress, Brother Norton, wishing to have the views of a most distinguished Spanish scholar upon the merits of the Revision, submitted the whole to his critical examination from the beginning of Matthew to the 25th verse of the 7th chapter of Luke, and took his opinion in writing, as follows: (Translation.) "I have seen, examined, and corrected the proofs from the beginning of Matthew to verse 25 of chap. vii of Luke, and judge them as perfect as possible."

Other Testimonies.—Bro. Crowe subsequently wrote from Central America, where he had returned to his work, and had begun to distribute the book as it came out in parts:

"It far surpasses my most sanguine expectations, and it fills my heart with gratitude to God, when I think of the good it must do both in Spain, and in these poor Ibero-American countries."

He again wrote:

"In order to realize the immediate practical advantages of the purer version, one must have used it, as I do continually, in teaching to read, and in reading from it, in the cottages of the poor, and the mansions of the rich, and one must then contrast it, as I have done, with the other versions used in the same manner. The great superiority of your version is then felt."

The following testimony was given before he had received complete copies of the Spanish New Testament, as issued by the Bible Union:

"The portion of *Il Nuevo Pacto* (the New Covenant) which you have printed, from Matthew to Romans, inclusive, is indubitably the greatest boon that has hitherto been extended to the Spanish-speaking nations of the earth. And it is the most effectual instrument that you could have furnished to the missionary of the gospel, in his attacks upon the idolatry and prejudices of these be-Romanized people.

"For my part, I feel that I am better armed than I was before. You have provided me with a new and trusty sword; and the old ones, though weapons of proof, being of ruder make, and of inferior metal, which have grown rather rusty now, shall henceforth

Digitized by Google

be hung up in some historic museum of sacred relics, among the old armor of departed pilgrims, to be looked at with affectionate remembrance, but to be *used* no more.

"A warmer eulogy than I am capable of penning, would be amply justified by the general faithfulness, minute accuracy, and crystalline clearness of your translation of the gospels into Spanish, the sonorous idiom of Castile.

"But what makes it doubly precious in my eyes, is the fact that it is, as nearly as may be, free from what may be called *ecclesiastical terms*, which very often convey a superstitious and false idea to the minds of those educated under Popish influences, even when verbally correct as translations. Add to this the facilities offered to the reader by the division into paragraphs, according to the sense; by the quotations being marked as such; by the preservation of the poetical form where it occurs; by the foot-notes explanatory of the meaning of foreign words; and by the beauty and purity of the modern orthography of the Spanish Academy, which is adopted, and which is marred neither by the ignorance of the compositor, nor the negligence of the editor.

"Why, the very clearness of the type and symmetry of the page speak eloquently to the heart as well as to the eye of the reader, as evidence of the holy veneration in which we hold the book of God, and the benevolent respect with which we regard those whom we invite to study it with us."

The Testament Ready. What shall be done with it?—Here was the book prepared. But Bro. Crowe died a martyr to the cause, having been imprisoned, till his health was ruined, by Roman Catholic magistrates impelled by Romish priests.

For what, then, we asked, did God lead us at this time, to prepare this faithful version of his word?

The question is now answered, and in such a manner as to fill us with exultant gratitude and adoration.

Proceedings in Europe and America.—Spain, till lately, triply barred and bolted against Protestantism and divine truth; Spain, the most bigoted of Catholic countries, was opened a few months ago by God, in his providence, for the reception of his word. Missionaries and colporteurs flocked thither to distribute scriptures. But soon the hearts of some of them began to quail before a growing conviction that the books which they were circulating

Digitized by Google

were not the most faithful versions of inspiration. They communicated their anxieties to their friends in England.

Our agent, Rev. Wm. Norton, was sent for. The book was solicited, and subjected for weeks to a most thorough examination by native Spaniards, and English scholars versed in the Spanish language, and especially by one who had traveled frequently in Spain, and thoroughly felt the need of distributing the pure truth of God.

The result of the examination was perfectly satisfactory. The merits of the translation secured the confidence and approbation of the pious and intelligent men who wished to have a faithful version of God's word circulated in Spain.

The same convictions were springing up in America. Inquiries were made for our books. Rev. Henry C. Riley, Episcopalian, Pastor of the Spanish church, in this city, called upon me, procured copies, carried them to Mexico, recommended and circulated them. Three sets of stereotype plates were made; one for use in America, one in Great Britain, one in Spain itself. A large edition was printed in Great Britain, and a still larger one in Spain. Seven missionaries in the latter country are now engaged in distributing the books, and the English Baptist Missionary Society and other bodies have taken up nearly the whole edition issued in Britain.

We have not space here to tell of what has occurred, and is occurring, in connection with our Testament in Europe. The facts are deeply interesting, but they must give place to others. This very day we have received a letter from Rev. Wm. J. Knapp (our beloved Baptist brother, lately Professor of Languages in Madison University, and subsequently at Vassar College, and now engaged in the evangelization of Spain), asking for copies. He says, "Do pray give me means to introduce the Nuevo Pacto into Madrid. Pray rouse the Baptists and come to the rescue."

Bro. Knapp has been appointed by the Board of the Bible Union our Bible Distributor for Spain.

Occurrences in Mexico.—James Heckley, a colporteur of the American Bible Society in Mexico, was much blessed in his labors, and immersed a number of converts; among the rest, Thos. M. Westrup. He ordained Mr. Westrup, who himself became a colporteur as well as preacher, and was instrumental in the conversion of many persons. Mr. Riley recommended to him our

Digitized by Google

Spanish Testament. The Baptist Home Mission Society forwarded to him documents, and we sent to him a copy of the Testament. Before he received it, he started on a journey to this city. He has been appointed a missionary of the American Baptist Home Mission Society: has been ordained as a Baptist minister by a large ecclesiastical council, and is on his way back to take charge of six Baptist churches already partly organized by him in Mexico, and to form others.

Bro. Westrup spent much time with me. He has read our book, and is delighted with it. He is full of zeal for giving it a wide dissemination in Mexico. His whole heart is in the work. Our conviction is, that he has been especially raised up by God, and qualified, to do in Mexico what Oncken has done in Germany. For this purpose he needs liberal appropriations of Spanish Testaments. Shall he have them? We here insert his appeal:

"NEW YORK, April 5, 1870.

"W. H. WYCKOFF, LL. D.—*Dear Brother:*—I have felt a great deal of pleasure in examining your Society's new version of the Spanish New Testament, and unhesitatingly pronounce it far superior to any other I am acquainted with.

"My desire is very strong to have it circulated in all Spanish speaking countries, and I hope to do so largely in the Republic of Mexico. Herewith I make the request of a supply of the same for myself and many friends there, who will be overjoyed to possess and circulate them.——Affectionately yours,

THOS. M. WESTRUP."

He has just placed in my hands a letter from a gentleman in Mexico largely engaged in the distribution of the Scriptures, from which he allows me to make the following extracts. It must be borne in mind that the writer is not a Baptist, but he is truly a pious man, and desirous of evangelizing the country in which he lives:

"MEXICO, 4th February, 1870.

"THOMAS M. WESTRUP, MONTEREY.—*My Dear Friend:*—In case of your separation from the Bible Society, I should indeed be glad to hear of your connecting yourself with the powerful Baptist Society; because, in the first place, the views held and propagated by that Society are, I believe, just those at which you have arrived; and in the second place, because, as I suppose, that Society would aim at doing a *great work* for the Lord in this coun-

Digitized by Google

try, and I would much like you to be the dispenser of the means they might employ. That this Society is in earnest with respect to the Spanish work, I infer by their having produced already a translation of their own of the New Testament, the language and style of which are superior indeed to anything yet seen. As you have never made mention of this, I conclude you have never seen it. You have therefore a treat to come. Pray hunt it up, as soon as you get to New York; it is called "*Nuevo Pacto*"; is by the American Bible Union, and bears date 1859.

"I would a thousand times rather circulate it than the ones I am now circulating; therefore, should you connect yourself with that Society, make your arrangements to come on to the capital, and bring some thousands of it along with you; or, if you have other plans in view, try and obtain a grant for me.

"I could easily get them into circulation, distributing them among our evangelical congregations. Also, let me know if I could also unite myself with them (the Baptists), not as a preacher of the doctrine of immersion, but to circulate their excellent version of the New Testament."

The writer of this letter communicates intelligence of fourteen evangelical congregations in Mexico, besides those organized by Bro. Westrup. The number of members in each, varies from twelve, to three hundred.

Now, my brother, my sister, you have the facts briefly narrated. Your heart glows under them. Do you not say to us, "Go on. The call is from God. Furnish the books as they are needed."

We know that your heart will prompt you thus to encourage us.

Of course, you will pray for us. You will ask for God's Spirit to accompany the distribution of His word. You will rejoice, and exult, and thank the Lord that Spain, and Mexico, and Cuba (we have not space to tell you about Cuba), are all open to receive the truth. And, oh! how you will thank Him, that we had a faithful Spanish Testament ready for distribution! How wonderful! How providential!

All ready, all prepared, *except the means of making the books. Every copy of the Spanish Testament is gone, and we have not a dollar in our Treasury to make another.*

Now, my brother, my sister, don't *wait;* send us something *immediately.* The King's business requires haste.

If you do your own duty promptly, then you will be prepared

Digitized by Google

to exhort others to do theirs. Take this circular from friend to friend, from house to house; to the prayer-meeting, to the church. Talk of it. Read it to others. Ask your pastor to read it to the people. Take extra collections. Help us; help Mexico; help the cause of Christ. Suppose that you are compelled to make sacrifices. Could you do it at a better time? Could you do it for a worthier object? If you have any doubt upon this, take this circular—spread it out in your closet; humbly, fervently, ask Jesus to guide you, to enable you to do your duty. If you will only act upon the convictions of your heart and your judgment, thus confidingly looking for the Spirit's influence to direct them, there will be—there can be—no doubt of the result. You will find yourself able to do something to advance the cause.

The Lord will bless you; He will smile upon your efforts, and prosper you.

Some of you will say that you are poor—that the meal is low in the barrel—the oil in the cruse. I believe you. Many of us feel this. But make a little cake for Mexico and Spain, and you will never feel that you have lost by it. The Lord Jesus will bless you, and you shall receive the plaudit, "Well done."

Your brother in the Lord,

WILLIAM H. WYCKOFF, *Cor. Sec.*

A. B. UNION, 32 GREAT JONES-ST., N. Y.

THE CRISIS IN THE GENERAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

The thoughtful and earnestly anxious among us feel that a decisive crisis is approaching in our General Missionary Society. It has been in existence now nearly a quarter of a century,—a time long enough, we should think, to test fairly the general missionary impulse among us. All, however, are aware that, thus far, nothing worth naming has signalized the history of the Society in the matter of its financial power, the number of actual *missionaries* on its records, and consequently in the results it has accomplished. Of course, if anywhere, by any instrumentality, one, or a hundred souls have been converted, it is a blessed gain. We are, however, as all will readily understand us, speaking of the Society's record as representing the free, combined mission-

Digitized by Google

ary power and impulse of our people generally,—as the combined work, in that direction, of the brotherhood in the United States. Nothing, thus far, has been done commensurate with the character, claims and aims of the Society as the *American General Missionary Society*. No one will pretend that an average of about *ten thousand dollars* a year, is a *sacrifice* that ought to be recorded as the worthy missionary fund of several hundred thousand people, representing, according to their numbers, their full proportion of the wealth of this rich country. Ten thousand dollars a year! let it not be named! It is not worthy of record—it is nothing! No one will say, that two great national anniversary conventions for inspiration and deliberation, with a mission of œcumenical character, and representing an enlightened, advanced people, under the special inspiration of the primitive gospel,—and *seven or eight thousand dollars* as a financial basis,—are two things at all in any reasonable proportion to each other! Two great national conventions, the presence of many leading men of talent, days of deep deliberation, a series of able addresses grandly developing the great world-power of the gospel of the grace of God, and the duty of the church of God relative to it,—and eight thousand dollars of war funds as the grand, general total of sacrifice to this end,—look, to our eyes, much like a full-armed Goliath of Gath and a very small pigmy going through the world together;—in the language of Solomon, they are "— — not equal."

But these things *can all be explained*. No doubt!—but whether the explanation is satisfactory or not to thoughtful, earnest minds, is not so very clear. It is declared *as a fact*, that we are as liberal as any other people. We rejoice to hear this, and do not know why we should not be so, with our claims, opportunities, means, and aims; indeed, it rather occurs to us,—to say that 'we are *as* liberal as any other people,' is not enough, with our claims. If there is any logical, necessary relation between true Christianity and true life,—and certainly there must be such,—then those that claim the one ought to manifest the other; and life is *action, sacrifice!—sacrifice, action!* So only we understand it. With our claims, therefore, we can only be consistent by proving ourselves *more* liberal than others. But resting with the '*as* liberal';—sitting and hearing this statement flatteringly, determinately, and constantly repeated, it also constantly occurs to us to ask ourselves silently, 'where is the proof of this in the missionary so-

Digitized by Google

ciety? Men can't believe things contrary to all fact. It is certainly not so,—in no possible sense so,—in our missionary work.' It is just, then, when such declarations are made, to explain carefully that this statement is true of our work in other directions, but not so in the missionary societies, in whose assemblies these statements are heard.

To refer to our activity in other matters, and then thus to compare ourselves with others, is certainly not fair, for these others are likewise thus active in these other directions, and will there certainly not suffer in comparison with us. We have done, and are doing, some great things; so are others in the same way. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians,—what great things are these not yearly doing in educational enterprises, in building meeting-houses, and in similar things! If we hold up our deeds there, they can fully meet and match us. Weekly we hear of individuals among these people giving many thousands at once for these aims. Let us, in the comparison, confine ourselves to comparing things in the same class.

It is said we are doing a great home work, preaching a great deal, and increasing rapidly, establishing churches, &c., &c. This is true,—at least much of it. There is in our cause and people, a marked *power* that has made itself felt,—a true, real, great power,—and the thoughtful, free-minded beyond us acknowledge this, and not seldom now speak highly of it. It will not do for any man among us, or outside of us, to assume contempt toward us,—it shows a poor understanding of things and a perverted feeling, in any one to do so. But while this is all true, it should be remembered that great progress in the same way is made by others likewise. The Methodists and Baptists, especially, are progressing wonderfully—they will not suffer much by comparison with us in this respect; and we honor the truth, and rejoice in knowing and recognizing it. "Whatsoever things are true....think on these things." We intend not to shut our eyes to the truth in any direction.

But it is also often said, by way of apology and explanation, that we are yet a young people; that our history is but short in comparison to that of the old denominations around us. This, doubtless, ought to be satisfactory to explain some of the things yet lacking among us, and in which others can boast against us. It is, however, not a *sufficient cause*, as philosophers say, to account

Digitized by Google

satisfactorily for the singular lack we are speaking of. We have already a clear history of about half-a-century; that is not so small a period;—we have already had a sufficient age for wonderful development in numbers, in influence, and in various other forms of established power. We have had all over the land where we are established, meeting-houses of our own, as well as others. Other people have to build meeting-houses, renew them, &c., as well as ourselves; indeed in many places we are building houses of worship superior to the denominations about us;—we are ahead. Where we are established, our power is as available as that of others. Besides, half-a-century now is in all respects, as to growth, progress, power, worth much more now than the same period in the past. We have been born in an auspicious day; the accumulated light of past centuries of experience was ours as soon as born; we entered at once, in many things, on a rich legacy. Especially is this true of the great missionary impulse. The beginnings of that,—in the modern ages, among Protestants, has but a late date. We were born not very long after its real, effective beginnings on anything like a noteworthy scale. We were born when the great misionary cry went stirring through the English and American world, when its inspirations were awakening the souls of men as never before, in the later centuries. The date of our beginning, in time and place, was most favorable for great life, for early greatness,—in the midst of a mighty, active, brave, religious age and people. Our progress, in numbers and power, shows what sort of opportunities were ours; they were every way grand. Let us not complain then, or borrow excuse, or even explanation, for defects, from the leanness of our years of life. God and man will demand a different account, on this head, from us! and let us even *yet* be prepared to render well that account. These declarations, therefore, in our missionary assemblies, of our great liberality in comparison to others, are, we fear, of more than doubtful propriety and wisdom. They are intended to explain our deficiency there, and cover up the blame of it. They flatter, instead of alarm to self-examination, the easy souls, who are ever willing to take up "ready praise;"—but the more earnest men cannot thus be prevented from seeing the actual fact as it is,—a very paltry few thousand dollars, that ought to be, can be, and often are, given by less than half-a-dozen churches, such as, in ability, we have all over the States, often close togeth-

Digitized by Google

er. Let our good, *charitable*, brethren remember,—reflecting minds cannot be deceived as to *facts*. Deserved praise is good and just; the Apostles gave it where deserved; and we have that in our past and present record, deserving of it;—but—rest assured, dear brethren, it is not befitting in our Missionary Society's meetings, with a financial record such as that before us in its entire history, to indulge in eloquent, congratulatory praise of our liberalities. Finally, as to this matter of comparison with others in our great liberalities, would it not be nobler, worthier of us, and reveal a manlier, truer spirit, to keep before us, evermore, the searching, heroic word, "What do *you* more than *others?*"—instead of the poor, easy consolation, 'we are doing about as well as others.' This would better befit us, especially as we, in our position and claims religiously, are altogether unwilling to allow this same rule, viz.: that our ground is as good as that of others, but indignantly reject it.

It has also been said that our failure thus far in the Missionary Society, has been owing to a want of proper organization. This is not a satisfactory answer. Organization and administration are beyond all question very important essentials to real and large and permanent success. The lack of these always induces feebleness, irregularity, and a want of continuance in action and results. But, in the first place, we have had an organization for years, as good,—indeed the same,—as other people have, and which in their hands has been wonderfully successful. It has not been so with us;—it has failed. The same organization, moreover, in the individual States, has been far more successful than in the General Society. Single State Societies have done with it as much as the General Society. Again, with all kinds of organizations, the simplest often and the least objectionable, in the States, after all comparatively but little of the power of the churches has been brought out,—nothing worthy of the strength of the people. The secret of this want of success must be looked for somewhere else. We do not feel like pausing here, now, to examine into the cause of this leanness in our General Missionary Society. But we cannot but feel and say,—if we had *all* had one heart, one mind, one aim, in this matter, in the right direction, it would not have been so. It is a great and good thing, of highest moment, to be one in *doctrine;* but it is of the highest moment also, to be one in *heart* and *hand*,—to be united in *action;*—to be able to *co-operate* as one

Digitized by Google

man, powerfully, in any great, glorious gospel work, such as the missionary society offers to us. This has never been done.—Whether it is in us to do this,—whether we can and will do it, is yet to be demonstrated.

There is now a crisis before us in the General Missionary Society, and it is with no ordinary interest we await the issue. Whatever that will be, it will,—at least for many years to come, so far as we can see, be decisive. After much deliberation, a good, efficient plan of action has now been produced and is meeting with the general consent of the brotherhood. State after state is adopting it with full unanimity. Objections to the *system* of operation, we are told, are now at an end. The road to general harmonious co-operation is fairly open. Now the real test is to come, whether we are in heart and soul a missionary people, and can work together as one, or not. If, after a sufficient trial, we *now* fail, then truly we have no farther hope in that direction.—The sad truth,—sad beyond expression, will then break with all the force of an unquestionable reality upon us, that either we are not in convictions and feeling a missionary people, or that with all our grand plea for Christian unity and union, we are altogether unable as a body, to join our hands actually in an organized, permanent work. Every true friend of the mission cause, and every one who has the interests and character of our brotherhood and cause deeply at heart, should feel the full importance of this crisis, and do his utmost with himself and others to bring about a good result.

Let there be an end of distrust, controversy and division.—The hearts of the best men and women among us are weary and sick of the useless, interminable strife. It is painful in the extreme to hear from week to week, from month to month, the expressions and instigations of distrust among brethren,—this sowing of the bitter seeds of alienation and strife among God's people, that should in love and unity work as one man in the strength of the Lord, in the great cause of the gospel mission and other good works. Every good man ought to resolve on one thing: to give no countenance to this evil, ugly work of fostering distrust, division and strife among us, and fearlessly and decidedly to rebuke any man engaged in this work of mischief. It is a deep shame that such evil-doing received a moment's countenance with us; it has embittered, alienated, divided and weakened

Digitized by Google

us, and in every way greatly marred our best enterprises for great good. Let there be an end of this! If there *is* not; and if there is not now a rising up in unwonted strength and unanimity of action, and in great sacrifice,—we shall live bitterly to regret it.

But *action* and *sacrifice* is now wanted. *Sacrifice*, we say. Let us understand this word. If we do not rise much higher in our actual *devotion* to the gospel mission, as contemplated in these societies; if those who have been giving ten dollars when they ought to have given a hundred; if those who have been giving a hundred when they ought to have given five hundred or a thousand, are not willing *now* to do their duty;—if we expect *organization*, *public conventions*, and the *idea of unanimity*, to give success;—if nobody is going to do any better than before, we must, of course, and ought to, fail; all, then, is but idle talk and idle hope,—mere deception of ourselves and others.

Let us meet the crisis before us nobly and grandly, as men, as Christians, emulating the devotion and sacrifice of the great primitive church!—in the glorious spirit of God's true men in every age,—of those who devoted their rich and grand lives to the glory of the Cross. "God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." C. L. L.

CHURCHES IN SCOTLAND.

The churches of every kind in Scotland are thus enumerated by the London *Daily Review:*

Established Church, 1257; Free Church, 873; United Presbyterian, 600; Episcopal, 157; Roman Catholic, 132; Congregational, 96; Baptist, 83; Morrisonian, 77; Cameronian, 44; Wesleyan, 34; United Original Seceders, 25; True and Original Cameronian, 11; Unattached Episcopalians, 8; Unitarian, 5. Total Churches, 3,402.

The population of Scotland is about 3,300,000; of whom about 500,000 "decline to be classified, or to be ecclesiastical in any way." Among these are the Moravians, Irvingites, and Primitive Methodists. Making this reduction, it appears that there is in Scotland one church for about 525 of all persons of fit age to attend,—a larger supply, it is said, than exists in any other part of the world, except the Papal States and the city of London.

Digitized by Google

BACCALAUREATE SERMON TO THE 26TH GRADUATING CLASS OF BETHANY COLLEGE.

BY PREST. W. K. PENDLETON.

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men; be strong. Let all your things be done with charity."—1 Cor. xvi. 13, 14.

I have selected these earnest words of Paul, as suggestive of the last words which we shall speak to you on your spiritual interests. Through our long and familiar intercourse it has been our constant aim to fit you for a noble life; to store your minds with knowledge; and with knowledge, to develop in you the power that will make knowledge efficient for greatness;—for knowledge is power, only so far as it is made to stir within us the divine, but too often dormant energies of the soul, which alone can lift us up above the common plane of mere sensuous experience, into the sphere of law and of ideas,—the region and realm of cosmical and psychical forces. The universe is *studied* through its phenomena,—it is *enjoyed* only through sympathy with its hidden forces. If the one oppresses us with a sense of burthen, the other refreshes us with sublimest power. We grope our way through labyrinths of geometry, to locate in their places the planets and the stars, and to trace their trackless courses through the impalpable void,—but when the difficult and tedious work is done, we lie down exhausted by the labor. It is only when, in calm contemplation, we review our task, and the wondrous symmetry breaks upon the eye, the "music of the spheres" swells upon the ear, and the solemn majesty of the motion rouses into action the kindred energies of the soul, that we wake to joyous sympathy with the mighty role of life, and feel that we too can "make our lives sublime."

But if all this wondrous order of power, this intricate interplay of forces, this harmonized jar of planetary and stellar discords, thus charm and inspire us, what shall be the influence of that power, who, central to all, assigns to each its place, its motion and its sphere, and to us the intellect to know and the heart to enjoy these sublime expressions of His wisdom! Nature has her priests,—but she is herself only the priestess of God. She sits in the high temple of his creations, and ministers by a ritual shown her in the holy of holies. Beautiful is her service, and

Digitized by Google

beneficent her delegated power to instruct, inspire and bless. She spreads for us "green pastures beside still waters," enamels the pathways with flowers of richest hues, and from her perfumed fingers sprinkles odors and blending chords of harmony, till the too loving heart seems imparadised in her arms. But she asks no worship. When, in our fondness, we would fall upon our knees before her, like the angel of the Apocalypse, she whispers, "See thou do it not: I am thy fellow-servant: worship God" (Rev. 19: 10). This is her lesson. She shows us great things, but they are the great things of God; she excites in us the spirit of worship, but tells us to worship God.

We know law only through uniformity and harmony;—we discover force only through pressure and motion. There is nothing known, *a priori*, of either, that warrants the conclusion that they are absolute or unconditioned. Both law and force are, in fact, among the most mutable of things. They are but means to ends, which God holds in his own right hand to modify in use as it pleaseth Him. Through the "liberty" and the "power of the gospel," man shall be ultimately raised superior to both, as he is now subject to both, for "we wait for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body" (Rom. 8: 23). "The law of the Spirit of life, in Christ Jesus, hath made us free from the law of sin and death" (Rom 8: 2).

This largeness of man, which places him above nature—which makes him a law-maker, and a master and modifier of force,—this human supremacy over this earth and all that it contains,—this higher destiny which puts him beyond the casualties of the present life, and involves him in relations and obligations which lie outside of and above the system of nature,—this it is which gives to man his true dignity in the universe, and upon which the apostle rests the exhortation of our text. It is only when we stand upon the commanding eminence on which Christianity places us, that we can understand ourselves or appreciate the responsibility of our position. So long as we feel ourselves the creatures of inexorable fate, helplessly bound in the meshes of law, and irresistibly whirled along in the vortices of inexplicable forces, we can not work with the energy of freemen, or feel with the consciences of moral agents. Philosophy and science make slaves of us, when they shut us up under the dominion of nature. The soul of man hath a dominion of her own. Psychology is generically

Digitized by Google

different from Biology. Man is more than matter. The body gravitates, the soul soars. Nature moves inexorably to death; the spirit broods upon the chaos of the grave, as upon the primal chaos, and life and immortality spring into light.

The words of our text are in the style of a warrior charging his soldiers for battle. They recognize a conflict, and appeal to the dignity and endowments of those who strike for deliverance. "Watch ye," is the first word of command. You are in the midst of enemies—the "rulers of the darkness of this world." They beleaguer the soul from without, and hold secret intercourse with the traitors within. To *watch* is to be attentive to what is going on around and within us. "Self-superintendence!" exclaims Coleridge, "that anything should overlook itself! Is not this a paradox, and hard to understand? It is, indeed, difficult, and to the imbruted sensualist a direct contradiction: and yet truly does the poet exclaim,

> '———Unless above himself he can
> Erect himself, how mean a thing is man.'"

Man is the only being known to us, that is invested with this power. He is not only a being of life, but a living being.—He not only shares that life which is the one universal soul of all organized being, given to "each after its kind," but he has a peculiar life,—a personal life,—a life specially imbreathed——becoming, through the mighty energy of God, a self subsisting soul, having life in itself; or, to put it in the grand simplicity of Moses, "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: and man became a living soul." Out of this self-subsistence grows the power of self-superintendence.

Each of us has a soul to *watch* for. We are responsible for all its infinite fortunes. No sentinel ever stood guard over treasure so rich, or environed with dangers so fearful. We carry a casket, filled with celestial jewels, through abysses of darkness, peopled with demons. On the right and on the left, siren voices allure us to sweet islands, "girded with snaky wiles." What if we pause to listen,—forget our treasures, forget to watch! You have seen a little child put upon a rope stretched across dizzy heights, and bid to walk to the anchor beyond. When there is a waver in the chord, a pause in the motion, a hesitancy in the step, a

Digitized by Google

flush upon the cheek and a tremor in the nerve; how we hold the breath, the heart stands still in sympathy with the peril, and we cry in silence, "God help thee!" A voice from the other end, from out of the darkness, cries, "Look up," "watch!" and the dizzy temptation is gone: the eye, steady to its duty, beams with the light of confidence, the step grows firm, and the peril is past. So the apostle, beholding us as we go forth on this dizzy verge of life, trembling amidst its dangers, pausing over its temptations, and faltering between its ways, cries unto us *to watch*.

Nothing great is accomplished without steadfastness. "The double-minded man is unstable in all his ways." He is a creature of circumstances—chasing shadows as they cross his path and cheat him with their mockery of life. And of such, it is, perhaps, but true to say, this present age and race of men is mainly made up. A great thinker has said, this is a "mechanical" age, and what is that, but an age in which the soul is surrendered to the outward—the spiritual to the material. In its blind idolatry, science seems bent on degrading us to the worm we tread on. The old superstition worshiped cunning images of its own carving; the modern builds a temple to its own discoveries. A nucleated proto-plasm takes the place of Isis, and the microscope sits upon the tripod of faith. We will admit nothing, that we cannot see, and if God has not made the eye powerful enough, we will improve it by convexity and complexity of lenses. Thus we are fast getting down to the little end of nothing, and boasting of our origin! The means are material, and the end will be feebleness. There is nothing great in the universe but man, and there is nothing great in man, but the soul. Degrade the soul, and all is degraded. Make it matter, and you make it mean, because you strip it of its divinely granted lordship, and enslave it to the mechanism of law. With nothing stable to start with, there can be no constancy in the progress. Physical theories, so called, we have, a plenty. Very ingenious are some of them, and beloved of their authors,—but like other pets, they already provoke much jealousy among their rival parents, and must, some of them, go down. Where there is so much contradiction, there must be much error,—and where there is error, there will be mutability. We have seen several infallible ones retire from the field of contest, and it is certain that a similar fate awaits a few more. It is safer to boast in taking off the armor than in putting

Digitized by Google

it on. "Time and the hours will bring relief to all parties. The grand encourager of Delphic or other noises is—The Echo. Left to themselves, they will soon dissipate and die in space."*

Meantime, let me exhort you, young brethren, to heed the cry of the great Apostle and "stand fast in the faith." I cannot exhort you to stand fast in philosophy, for no philosophy known to me, has itself been able to stand but a little while. Sensationalism, Idealism, Scepticism, Mysticism, Eclecticism,—these are all called great systems, but they rise and fall like the waves, and are as unstable as they. I cannot exhort you to stand fast in science, for she too, with her boasted demonstrations, has in her march through the ages, kicked over many a proud pedestal of her own erection. Pythagoras goes down before Ptolemy,—Ptolemy before Tycho Brahe—and he again before Copernicus. The splendid discoveries of Newton in light fade under the more thorough analysis of Brewster,—and to-day our Professors are calling for Text-Books that are *up to the times* and free from the false and exploded theories of the less than a-quarter-of-a-century-old times. Indeed, so little steadfast is she, that it is no uncommon thing to find our most honored savants furnishing the best refutations of their own demonstrations! Do not understand me as intending to disparage either philosophy or science, in their true spheres. I would not willingly come behind any man in giving them the honor and the use that God intended for them. Religion itself has been made the instrument of cruelties, for which humanity might blush—and so we need not be surprised, if Philosophy and Science shall be perverted to subvert holier truth.—Against these base uses of God's richest blessings we exhort you to *watch*.

These change, and in them there can be no steadfastness. But were they immutable, fixed as the Mathematics, they could not inspire the steadfastness to which the apostle exhorts. The broadest, deepest wants of the soul, they do not comprehend. Science, with all her seeing, is blind before the mystery of death; Philosophy, in her yet sublimer reaches, folds her wing at the dark valley, or falters in uncertain flight. The resurrection is beyond the synthesis of science; and heaven higher than the dreams of philosophy. The apostle points us to a broader, more

* Carlyle.

Digitized by Google

enduring basis—the basis of faith—"the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." "There is," says Coleridge, "no standing out without some firm ground to stand on: and this faith supplies. By faith in the love of Christ the power of God becomes ours. When the soul is beleaugured by enemies, weakness on the walls, treachery at the gates, and corruption in the citadel, then by faith she says—Lamb of God slain from the foundation of the world! thou art my strength! I look to thee for deliverance! And thus she overcomes. The pollution *(miasma)* of sin is precipitated by his blood, the power of sin is conquered by his Spirit. The apostle says not—Stand by your own resolutions and purposes; but—*steadfast by faith.* Nor yet, steadfast in your will, but steadfast in the faith. We are not to be looking to, or brooding over ourselves, either for accusation or for confidence, or (by a deep yet too frequent self-delusion) to obtain the latter by making to ourselves a merit of the former. But we are to look to Christ and to *him crucified.* The law *that is very nigh to thee, even in thy heart;* the law that condemneth and hath no promise; that stoppeth the guilty past in its swift flight, and maketh it disown its name; the law will accuse thee enough. Linger not in the justice-court listening to thy indictment. Loiter not in waiting to hear the sentence. No, anticipate the verdict. Appeal to Cæsar. Haste to the King for a pardon. Struggle thitherward, though in fetters; and cry aloud, and collect the whole remaining strength of thy will in the outcry—*I believe;* Lord, help my unbelief. Disclaim all right of property in thy fetters. Say that they belong to the old man, and that thou dost but carry them to the grave, to be buried with their owner!—Fix thy thoughts on what Christ did, what Christ suffered, what Christ is—as if thou wouldst fill the hollowness of thy soul with Christ. If he emptied himself of glory to become sin for thy salvation, must not thou be emptied of thy sinful self to become righteousness in and through his agony and the effective merits of his cross? By what other means, in what other form is it possible for thee to stand in the presence of the Holy One?" Therefore, be *steadfast in the faith.*

We shall soon give you to the busy activities of life. We know not, we cannot know, in what of the many paths that open before you, it will be your fortune to tread. But trouble and disappointment will meet you all. This is the common lot. When

Digitized by Google

nature and friends have done their best, out of your own hearts in conflict with other hearts, and the stern battle with the evils of the world that enfold us all, there will come to you moments, hours, perhaps years, that will try the stuff you are made of, and put your "utmost graces to the foil." You may have to turn back from the pursuit of some high ambition, in the humility of defeat, to test your fortitude; you may have to see beautiful castles of your own building razed in ruin, and be tempted to despair; friends of years, when the heart is fondest, may forsake you, to shake your confidence in man; and out of that "wide forest" of the past, whence

> "The smell of violets, hidden in the green,
> Pour back into your empty soul and frame
> The times when you remember to have been
> Joyful and free from blame,"

there may arise lonely forms, "stiller than chiseled marble standing there," "turning on your face the star-like sorrows of immortal eyes," and saddening you with deathless regrets;—these and other griefs may jar you in your course, and shake your firmness; but, when you pass out of our sight, and fancy following pictures, in trembling, your path, O, let us say, in comfort, of each of you, *Whatever betides, we know he is steadfast in the faith! Though all else is wrecked around him, he stands upon the rock, and loud above the thunder of the storm, lifts his unfaltering voice to God.*

Of this faith is born sublimest strength. Manliness is the divine port of Christian confidence; and hence the Apostle adds, "Quit you like men,—be strong." I cannot think that any of you proposes to himself a life of inglorious ease,—to lie supinely upon the bank, and see golden labor sifting the glittering sands of Pactolus and heaping to itself the scattered wealth of Midas, without a manly struggle for the true riches. It was the sin of the Laodiceans that they were *neither cold nor hot.* They said, "We are rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing, and did not know that they were wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." Therefore said "the Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God, I counsel you to buy of me gold tried in the fire, that you may be rich, and white raiment that you may be clothed, and that the shame of your nakedness do not appear, and anoint your eyes

Digitized by Google

with eye-salve that you may see." We send you forth in the belief that you will heed this counsel, and "quit you like men."

Faith married to noble action, covers the life with glory. Faith steadies the hand and inspires the heart,—action strikes the blow and leads out the hidden waters; faith sees the right and is willing to trust it,—action strikes off its fetters, and hands it to the place of honor; faith looks up,—action lifts up; the two in blessed union make the world's conqueror.

Action is the grandeur of the American character. In this we are like the ancient Romans, but with vastly superior resources of knowledge and instruments. Lucan has finely said of Cæsar—*Nil actum reputans, si quid superesset agendam*—He thought nothing done, if anything remained to be done." It is so with us.—We are content with no work of the past. No sooner is one enterprise accomplished, than we fly with restless energy to another. This, too, is the character of the Christian. Paul, than whom humanity presents us with no nobler type of manly energy, looking at his past attainments, says, "Not that I have already won, or am already perfect; but I press onward, if, indeed, I might lay hold on that, for which Christ also laid hold on me. Brethren, I count not myself to have laid hold thereon; but this one thing I do—forgetting that which is behind, and reaching forth to that which is before, I press onward towards the mark, for the prize of God's heavenly calling in Christ Jesus" (Philip. 3: 12–14). This restless onwardness, was one of the striking features of Paul's character. His soul rose, like the lion's mane, in the presence of danger. His energy leaped upon opposition, like the thunderbolt upon the knotted oak, and flung it from his pathway. Onward for the mark! forward for the prize! "Experience was but the the arch wherethrough gleamed the untraveled" course leading to the goal, and like Ulysses he felt

> "How dull it is to pause, to make an end,
> To rust unburnished, not to shine in use!
> As though to breathe were life."

Action, we have said, is the grandeur of the American character;—but action is not necessarily good. There is an energy of demons as well as of gods, and I am not sure but the former mingle largely in the drama of the day. Certain am I, that the national activity is not profoundly moral, or highly religious,—

Digitized by Google

President-making calls forth boundless energies, it is true—but I cannot see that it springs from any high instinct of patriotism, or that it moves by principles that morality can sanction. The national activity is utilitarian, not Christian. It is determined from without—is prudential, not moral. It will do the wrong thing, if it deems the best. It walks by sight, not by faith. The true, the beautiful and the good are no motives to it. If it does any thing in their service, it is because there is pecuniary profit in it. Pictures are made to sell—made, theerfore, to suit the market; and they are bought for vanity. Love of art is only another name for love of show. The age cherishes no high ideals. Genius is valued, not venerated. To be noble is to put too fine a point upon nature. High chivalrous honor! but few believe in it. It is a thing rather to be commiserated in this sharp age of trade-craft. That a man should swear to his own hurt and change not,—speak for the right, and right loyally rise up in the face of interest, in the face of scorn, and do the right, this is a marvel great as a miracle. Whiskey rings embrace the nation. Within the golden circle things change their nature. Immunity to fraud is a question of bargain and sale—not of virtue and morality. The thing that pays, is the thing that goes,—the thing also called right.

In the midst of this demon-acting, the voice of the apostle comes to us, crying—*Act the man!* Ἀνδρίζεσθε! Do this, which is the same thing also as saying, Do not do that! A man is a being with reason,—a being with conscience. He is not a brute, that follows his nostrils, and feeds with remorseless greed upon anybody's corn that happens to fall into his crib. He sees the true, and feels the right, and by divine pregrogative puts his heel upon the evil and crushes the wrong. If a thing is manly, the apostle says, *do it;* if otherwise, *do it not.*

Let us think of you, young brethren, going forth from the halls of Bethany College, as determined to *quit you like men,*—to be known in every walk of life for your energy, your honor, your fidelity, your zeal! Take your rank at once among God's nobility; like Moses, "choose rather to suffer affliction with them, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, esteeming reproaches for Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt," and you shall not fail of the recompense.

Finally, "Let all that you do be done in love." Creation is

Digitized by Google

the fruit of love. God's superfluity overflows in works of love. It is his glory to manifest Himself; and every manifestation of his power must be in harmony with his ineffable perfections. As cycle after cycle fills up with his creations, he beholds the work of each day and pronounces it good. At length Nature stands forth, a power in herself, with limited independence, to work out the good committed to her ministry. Her work, too, is a work of love. But above nature, he has placed man—a duality of body and soul; the body in the likeness of nature, the soul in the likeness of God. As to the body,—born of nature and organized with senses, to know and enjoy the material, the finite; as to the soul,—created of God, and filled with his Spirit, to know and enjoy the spiritual—the infinite. It is quite the fashion, with certain shallow religionists, to speak scornfully of matter. We say to such, do not deride yourself;—"What God has joined together, let not man put asunder." Sin is the creation of freedom, and freedom is of the soul. In the ideal Adam—the Adam of Paradise—matter was the manifestation of beauty. It shall be again. It was degraded with the soul by sin; it shall be ennobled again through righteousness. For this we wait—for this we work. "The earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God.....And not only they, but ourselves also who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *to wit*, the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 16-23).

This is the lofty aspiration of all who are in Christ—the deathless yearning of the redeemed, the cry of the "souls under the altar, slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held, crying with a loud voice, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost though not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" White robes are given to them, and they are to rest for a little season, till we, their fellow-servants, and their brethren shall fill up the ranks of the martyrs. This is our work —to suffer for the word of God, and for the testimony given us to hold. Let us do it, says the apostle, in love. It is a work begun in the love of God, and to be carried on in love by his people.

We have no commission to hate our fellow men, any more than we are called to hate ourselves. "Love your neighbor as you love yourself," hath only this antithesis, Hate your neighbor as

Digitized by Google

you hate yourself. This is the only hating lawful to the Christian, and what is this but the conflict of love. Because I love myself as God loves me, and would save myself as God would save me, so do I hate this sin in myself which hinders this saving work of love. But our Christianity has, I fear, made but little progress in this divine perfection. It is love for *the cause* rather than for man; hence we grow sectarian and proscriptive. Even preachers sometimes grow red in the face and denunciatory in style, when they think of men who will not be guided by them. Fierce gestures and bitter words call forth no life. If you will see verdure spring up on your pathway, go forth shod with the preparation of the gospel. Let your "feet be beautiful as of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things" to the people.

And now we send you forth on this mission of love, with our prayers uplifting you in the task. O, be true to the sublime trust! Let your heart overflow to every sufferer, your voice of invitation sound to every wanderer. Make the blind to see, the deaf to hear, the lame to walk. Soothe the bed of sickness, wipe the tear of sorrow, quicken with electric sympathy the friendless, helpless dead—preach the gospel to the poor. Force it upon them by the importunity of love,—the love of God and the love of souls in your own hearts. Bring heaven about you in an atmosphere of love, in God's own manifestation of it, through the Cross, and then will your life be beautiful and your labor immortal. Every soul redeemed will be a star in your crown, and in the day of reckoning, you will be permitted to gather them about you before the Throne, and say in grateful confidence, "These Thou hast given me; we come to behold thy glory."

May God help us to watch—to be steadfast in the faith—to quit us like men—to be strong—to do all that we do in love!

Be not amongst wine-bibbers; amongst riotous eaters of flesh. For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty, and drowsiness shall clothe a man with rags.

If thine enemy be hungry, give him bread to eat; and if he be thirsty, give him water to drink. For thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head, and the Lord shall reward thee.—*Prov.*

Digitized by Google

ROMANS V. 12.—QUERIES.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—Permit me to ask you to favor us with an exposition of Rom v. 12, with a view of settling the following queries:

1. What death is signified? Does the word death, which twice occurs, refer to the same thing each time?

2. What is the force of the word *so* (οὕτως)? Does it indicate *fact*, or *manner*, either or both?

3. What is the meaning of the words ἐφ' ᾧ, rendered "for that?" What is the antecedent of the pronoun ᾧ?

4. "All have sinned," Does this refer to *actual* sin, to personal transgression? What is the logical relation of this clause to the preceding part of the verse?

It is the meaning and grammatical relation of the words that I seek, that I may know the *doctrine* of the passage.

W. W. HAYDEN.

ANSWER.

1. I think we should take "death" (θανατος) in its simple and obvious sense, in both places:—that is to say, we cannot assume that Paul had in his mind any theoretical distinction of physical and spiritual death, but simply "death," as all men see and understand it,—the phenomenon which terminates the connection of man with this life. Whatever consequences may be connected with it, or follow after it, are, of course, logically involved, but not intentionally distinguished, as matter of argument or speculation. We cannot use them in legitimate exegesis. This is evident from the expression, "and so death passed upon all," and further from the 14th v., where it is said, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression."

In the expression, "And *so* death passed upon all, the (οὕτως) "so" refers to the *way* in which the consequence, which is death, comes to pass upon all,—that is, through sin entering by one.—Having said that *sin entered by one man*, and *death by sin*, he proceeds to state that through the connection of sin and death, thus introduced by one man, death *passes* upon all. It is for the interpreter to say, whether a consequence could legitimately pass from Adam to his race, unless he stood in some representative relation to them, or transmitted it, as a nature. Before his fall,

Digitized by Google

there was in Adam, *a possibility of sinning*. In the fall, this became *prava concupiscentia*, "evil desire,"—*proclivitas peccandi*, "a tendency and prevalent disposition to sin"; and through this, what was before only a *possibility of dying*, became a *necessity of dying*, and "so" this *necessity* passed upon all. Did that which caused t also pass?

3. I think the pronoun ὦ has no antecedent, but is used here, as in 2 Cor. v. 4, in connection with ἐπί, as a conjunctive. It has the force of "because,"—or "in that." It is true that the Vulgate translates ἐφ' ὦ by *in quo*, "in whom," referring directly to Adam,—but this is conceded to be a forced and unwarranted construction.

4. Instead of "All have sinned," we should read, "All sinned" —as the verb (ἥμαρτον) "amarton" is in the aorist Tense. It merely states the fact historically. We cannot very well answer what kind of sin is referred to here, without entering into a discussion of the *doctrine* of the passage. We may say in brief, however, that it is a sin in which, the apostle says *all*, (not all *men*) but all, the whole human race, are involved. "Death passed upon all, in that or because all sinned." It is a sin, because of which death came upon all,—and as many subjects of death are children, we can scarcely restrict the sin to actual personal transgression of law. Besides, even in cases where persons were capable of sin, the apostle teaches, that their death was not because of their actual transgressions, for "sin is not imputed where there is no law," yet death reigned over such as had no law, even from Adam to Moses. Wherefore? For their actual sins? No. For these were not imputed where there was no law. For what then, if not for the sin of the one man?

You will see that I understand the *logical* relation of the latter clause to the preceding part of the verse to be, that of reason and conclusion, and the essential relation to be, that of cause and effect.

You have got hold of one of the most difficult passages in the scriptures, and I trust you will not dismiss it without a thorough investigation. It involves the profoundest questions of our nature and freedom, and cannot be fully discussed from the narrow ground of verbal criticism. You begin right, however, in seeking first clearly to understand the grammatical relation of the words which the Apostle uses, in expressing his thoughts.

W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

WHAT IS SECTARIANISM?

We asked this question in the April number of the HARBINGER, and especially requested the *Review*, the *Standard* and the *Apostolic Times* to give us the benefit of their thoughts and conclusions on the subject. As yet we have no line from the *Standard* or the *Apostolic Times;* but the *Review*, with its characteristic promptness, has given us a very frank reply, which we lay before our readers. We still expect to hear from the rest. I now ask the question, Would not the responses from these three sources make a very useful and interesting tract on this subject? What say you, brethren? The theme is eminently practical, and you are all just the men to see and feel it as it is. As Bro. Franklin says, I mean this for *good*. Let us make good come of it. But for the present, we will say no more.

The following is the response of Bro. Franklin. He says:

"We copy the above from the *Millennial Harbinger*, April number, current year, p. 236. We may not see precisely the point in thus earnestly calling attention to this subject just *now*, but think we do. It can hardly be that Pres. Pendleton needs or wants any special illumination on the subject for *his own* satisfaction, or if he did, that he would expect to obtain it from any of those whose attention he has invited to the matter. The probability is that he sees something among us that he thinks is *sectarian*, most likely on the part of some of us speaking most loudly against sectarianism. He possibly thinks those he has in his eye do not know what the *thing* is, which they call sectarianism, and he may only be aiming, in an unassuming and very modest way, to elicit a little light and bring the party or parties, as the case may be, to understand their whereabouts a little more fully. He believes we are all honestly against the thing called *sectarianism* in name, but he is not so sure we are equally against it in fact. But we stop not to speculate about his precise object, further than to maintain the general impression that he means it for *good*. We rather like the solicitation for an examination of the subject, and heartily approve his open and free method of calling the matter up, and say, in the commencement, that we are much obliged to our worthy brother, for thus introducing the matter. We think we know what sectarianism is, and we care not who is infected

Digitized by Google

with it, where the infection is, within or without, we hate it from the depths of our soul, and hope Pres. Pendleton will be successful in obtaining, as he desires, not merely 'a general definition of the word, but a real life-like picture of the thing, as it exists in the present day.' Would that we were the artist that could draw such a picture for him. It might be a *good* picture, and an accurate one, but it would only be a *good* picture of a *bad* thing, or an exact picture of an *ugly* thing. We regret that we are called on to participate in the performance of such a nice, and yet such an important task. We would much prefer *reading* to *writing* on such a delicate subject. But we responded the first time we were ever called on to speak in the church and are now getting too old to decline. We, therefore, go to work.

"We perceive at once that this will be, at least in one point, as John Wesley was accustomed to say of anything that pointed within, 'plain and home work.' Including the heading, our worthy brother invites attention to three questions:

"1. What is sectarianism?

"2. Are we a sect?

"3. Are there sectarians holding prominent and representative position among us?

"Without further preliminary we proceed to our task:

"1. *What is sectarianism?* Probably no word in common use is generally used so carelessly, and with so little regard to its meaning. There are certain meetings and conventions, styled by their friends unsectarian. Some publications, in the form of periodicals and newspapers, are styled unsectarian by their friends. The Sunday-School Union and the American Bible Union claim to be unsectarian. But in nine cases out of ten nothing is meant by unsectarian, only the avowal that the peculiarities of no party are advocated in such meetings, conventions, publications and institutions. But this cannot be the meaning of unsectarian or *not sectarian*. Sectarian is defined, 'pertaining to a sect; one of a sect.' But what does the word *sect* mean? In the common version of the New Testament the word *sect* occurs five times. The original Greek word which it represents occurs nine times in the New Testament, but is translated *heresy* once and *heresies* three three times. That word is *hairesis*. It is not applied to the kingdom or body of Christ by any sacred writer. It is only twice so applied in the New Testament by anybody. Acts xxiv. 5, in the

Digitized by Google

speech of Tertullus, accusing Paul, he styles the apostle 'a ringleader of the *sect* of the Nazarenes.' The King James' translators evidently understood the original word *hairesis*, here rendered 'sect,' to mean *heresy*, for, in Paul's reply (Acts xxiv. 14), they so translate it, in the following passage: 'But this I confess to you, that after the way which they call *heresy*, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." Tertullus looked upon the followers of Christ as a schism, or faction, split off from the Jews, and a very contemptible schism, or faction, at that. Acts xxviii. 22, the body of Christians, or Disciples of Christ, is styled 'this sect,' by chief men among the Jews. In this case they intended no unkindness, but spoke of the body in the style to which they had been accustomed, evidently taking it for granted, and regarding it as a settled thing, that it was a *sect*. But the body of Christ is never so regarded or treated in any expression of a sacred writer.

"Acts v. 17, we read of 'the sect of the Sadducees,' as a faction or a schism of Jews, and in Acts xv. 5, we read of 'the sect of Pharisees,' as another schism of Jews. To this latter class Paul alludes in the phrase, 'the most strict sect of our religion,'—meaning the Jew's religion, or system of faith and worship (Acts xxvi. 5), using the word in the same sense. In the only three remaining occurrences of the original word, *hairesis*, it is rendered *heresies* in the common version. In one instance (Gal. v. 20), it is put down in the catalogue of 'the works of the flesh,' which, Paul says, 'are manifest.' Titus iii. 10, *hairetickos* is translated *heretic* in the following sentence: 'A man that is a heretic, after a first and second admonition reject.' This exhausts the use of the word in the New Testament. It may be added that the Jews, as a whole, or as a body, are not, so far as we can call to mind, called a *sect* by any sacred writer. With these Scriptures, and all the definitions we now think of, in view, we arrive at the following conclusions:

"1. The word *sect* means a system or faction split off from the main body, whether of Jews, Christians, or any other sort of people. A party split off from the body of Christ, is a *sect* or *schism*.

"2. To be the cause of such schism, or sect, in its formation or splitting off, a leader or active operator in it, is a great sin—an evidence of *carnality*, of not having the Spirit.

Digitized by Google

"3. *Sectarianism* consists of the theories, tenets and works that produce schism, and, when applied to the church, schism in the body of Christ.

"4. A *sectarian* is one who presses theories, tenets and principles, such as tend to divide Christians, produce schism among them; it may be in urging something on the body unauthorized, or opposing something required in Scripture; one who excuses divisions, apologizes for them, sympathizes with schism and schismatics more than with the body and the firm members of the body.

"II. *Are we a sect?* Much care must be used in fixing the right meaning on the little word 'we,' in this question. We suppose that our brother used it in reference to the people visibly united in one body, and known in several countries as Christians, Disciples of Christ, but styled by sundry hard and uncomely names by others, who do not like to call them Christians, or Disciples of Christ. These Disciples of Christ, or Christians, claim to be members of the body of Christ—to belong to *no other body*. We may not know, and doubtless do not, in all cases, who or how many precisely are included in the general body. It, however, includes the whole family, the entire number of the redeemed, —all the children of God. Defining the word 'we,' then, as used by President Pendleton, as meaning the children of God in the aggregate, or the body of Christ, we deny that *we are a sect.* We did not split off from the Romish Church, from the true Church, or from any Church, but have been called out, by the preaching of the Word, from the world and from the various departments of error and superstition, and united in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ. Or, defining it as we suppose he meant, to mean the body of Christians, as we now exist and appear in the congregations in different parts of the world, are we a *sect.*— In that sense we are not a *sect.* We are not a party or schism split off from the true Church, or any Church; but, so far as we extend in number, as members of the body, we go toward composing the body or kingdom, which is composed of all the saints.— If the word 'we,' then, is used to mean the body or kingdom of Christ, in the aggregate, it is not a *sect*; or, if used only to mean so much of the body as is united in the congregations, in different parts of the world, and known as Christians, or Disciples of Christ, they are no *sect.* The body of Christ, in the aggregate,

Digitized by Google

is not a sect, and the parts of this aggregate body found in different parts of the world, but united with Christ and the whole body, are no sect.

"III. *Are there sectarians holding prominent and representative position among us?* This is a more difficult question to discuss.—To say *there are* rests a charge somewhere, and makes it a *personal matter*. Some one fiercely calls out, 'Name your man.' If you name a man, it amounts to a charge, on which, if convicted, he should be admonished a first and second time, and then rejected. The course some men pursue is such as to create doubt and distrust—to destroy confidence. You may be sorry it is so, but you cannot help it; yet you would not be willing to name them out, make a charge against them and undertake to prove it.—Some men involve their moral character in precisely that kind of predicament. It abounds with imprudences, improprieties and such unseemliness as to create doubts about their moral integrity. Their names are proposed for places of high trust, and objections are made. They are fierce, and demand the grounds of your objection. You intimate that you fear all is not right. They at once turn spiteful enemies, and demand of you to produce your charge, and make your statements in tangible form, and they will meet you. That all sounds well, and is proper if one man makes an attack on the character of another. If a man is on trial, he is to be held innocent till he is proved guilty. But there are degrees in going into sin. There are incipient steps.—In the early stages, but few notice anything wrong, and but little is said. The steps in the wrong direction become more frequent, more bold and open. More notice is attracted, more is said. Confidence is giving away on all sides, but no one is prepared and willing to take the trouble and encounter the ill-will of prosecuting the case, and possibly the proof could not be made out sufficiently clear to convict. What is to be done? Must all have confidence? That is impossible. There may still be a preponderance of evidence against a man, enough to fill the minds of the people with doubts, and destroy confidence generally, but not enough clearly to convict. What is to be done? Allow all to enjoy their own opinion, and wait for further developments. An innocent man might be accused, but he will see to it that he does not lay himself liable to the same accusation by his doubtful conuct again.

Digitized by Google

"In Paul's time the mystery of iniquity was already at work, and he mentioned it, though he did not definitely locate it, name the men, nor personally call them to account. The men and their work were not sufficiently developed yet for that. Apostasy in an individual is not an instantaneous thing, much less is it so in a body. But in our time the momentum is great. Movements are rapid. We do not desire to believe there is a retrograde tendency among us—a tendency to lapse back into sectarianism, and there may not be a single man aiming at such a thing or desiring it; but we are impressed with the unwilling conviction that such a tendency exists in our midst, and it is useless for us to try to avoid the impression. So long as we mingle among the people, hear the preachers, read the publications, and think at all, the conviction becomes deeper and deeper. The man of sin did not develop himself in a single day, nor a year, nor even a century. The apostasy had its incipiency, but gradually and certainly progressed on till it culminated in a full-grown pope, with his heel on the necks of kings, and they ignominiously bowing and cringing at his feet. We are not making definite charges against any man, or set of men, nor do we desire to prove any man a sectarian, or an apologist for sectarians or sectarianism, or a sympathizer with either, and shall rejoice if no man shall *prove himself* such. We are all making record, developing something, and a culmination will manifest itself somewhere. We desire no man's reputation to suffer. Would that we could see all of one mind and one spirit, in harmony and love. But we do not see this.—There are two elements in our midst, entirely alien to each other, at war, as much as flesh and spirit, in Paul's description. Some are clearly drifting into one current, and some into the other. The different things in which they manifest themselves, at one time in this and then in that, are not the *cause*, but only the *occasion* for manifestation. These two elements have existed fifteen years or more, but their growth has been continuous, and is increasing of late. In one half-hour's conversation the one or the other can be detected. The symptoms are discernible to any person of moderate spiritual discernment.

"We do hope and pray that the love of Christ and of the souls of men may so fill our hearts as to enable us to rise above these corroding elements and sensual impulses, so as to see and fully appreciate their disastrous results. We see no way for us to escape

Digitized by Google

the evils anticipated more readily than by so engaging in spreading the gospel as to have no time nor money to spend in any partisan or schismatical movement. Mercy and peace on the Israel of God."

BETHANY COLLEGE.

The annual meeting of the Board of Trustees of Bethany College, took place on Wednesday, June 15th, 1870. Fifteen members of the board were present. On the announcement of the death of John Mendel, the following tribute of respect was unanimously passed:—

"Whereas it has pleased the Supreme Disposer of events to remove from our midst, since the last meeting of the board, our highly esteemed fellow-member, John Mendel;

Resolved, That in the death of John Mendel, the Trustees of Bethany College have lost a most faithful and efficient coadjutor, who, by his punctual attendance at their sessions during many years, and his earnest devotion to the interests of the College, has shown his ardent attachment to the institution, and to the ends for which it was established.

Resolved, That while we humbly bow in submission to the irrevocable decree of an all-wise Providence, we would hereby express our deep sense of a bereavement which has deprived the board of one of its most useful members, and the community at large of one of its most honored citizens.

Resolved, That the editor of the Millennial Harbinger be requested to publish these resolutions."

Elder John F. Rowe, of Ohio, Dr. Wm. J. Barbee, of Mississippi, and Alexander Campbell, of West Virginia, were elected members of the Board of Trustees.

The report of the President, embracing detailed reports from all the members of the Faculty, gave the most satisfactory evidence of prosperity in all the departments.

The degree of Master of Sciences, in course and ordinary, was created, and the post-graduate course of studis recommended by the Faculty, established.

Ninety-one students were in attendance during the past session, representing sixteen States in the Union.

Digitized by Google

Having passed a satisfactory examination, in all the schools of the classical course, the degree of Bachelor of Arts was conferred upon the following fourteen students of the College:

G. J. Anderson,..... Richmond, Va.
W. S. Atkinson,..... Morristown, Ohio.
W. C. Gans,..... Pierce, Ohio.
Jno. G. Hawley,..... Detroit, Mich.
B. H. Hayden,..... Paw Paw, Mich.
H. W. List,..... Wheeling, W. Va.
W. C. Lyne,..... Richmond, Va.
F. H. Mercer,..... McMinnville, Tenn.
H. N. Mertz,..... Bellaire, Ohio.
B. W. Peterson,..... Wheeling, W. Va.
W. H. Spencer,..... Chilesburg, Ky.
R. W. Thomas,..... Austin, Texas,
G. N. Tillman,..... Shelbyville, Tenn.
A. B. Wells,..... Bradford, Ky.

The honorary degree of A. M. was conferred upon J. R. Gaff, of Chambersburg, Penna., B. H. Smith, of Missouri, and James Atkins, of Georgia.

The Financial Agent reported twenty-five thousand dollars of additional subscriptions to the several funds of the College, during the past year.

Resolutions and orders contemplating the completion of the college buildings were passed, and it is expected that the whole will be placed under roof during the present year.

The entire harmony in the Board, with the commendable enthusiasm of all its members, and the deep interest manifested by the Faculty and students, give unusual assurance of the future welfare of the institution.

Catalogues, furnishing all necessary information in detail, can be had on application to President W. K. Pendleton, Prof. C. L. Loos, or the Secretary of the Board.

ALBERT ALLEN, Sec'y of Board.

He that saith unto the wicked, Thou art righteous, him shall the people curse; nations shall abhor him: but to them that rebuke him shall be delight, and a good blessing shall come upon them.—PROV.

Digitized by Google

CHURCH NEWS.

BELLEVERNON, PA., June 1st, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—We are just now in a very interesting meeting:—five already, and I think but a beginning made. The Lord is still working with the people. I received six into my own congregation three weeks since.

O. G. HERTZOG.

SUNDAY SCHOOLS—ATTENTION.

We will send, *postage paid*, back numbers of the Christian Monitor, for distribution in Sunday schools, at the low rate of *one dollar and a half per hundred*—(one cent and a half per number).

Address Mrs. M. M. B. GOODWIN, Indianapolis, Ind.

OBITUARIES.

DIED, at his residence on the fifteenth day of April, 1870, ROBERT MINGUS, an Elder of the Church of Christ in Philadelphia. He was born in this city in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred. He united with the Dutch Reformed church in Philadelphia, under Dr. Broadhead, at the age of sixteen. After a most careful examination of the New Testament, he became convinced that it was his duty to be immersed. He then joined one of the Baptist churches in his native city; and was encouraged to exercise his gifts in the ministry of the Word. He was a diligent and faithful student of the Bible, and conscientiously acted up to his convictions of duty as light from its sacred pages was received by him. He early became acquainted with the "Disciples" in Philadelphia, and having examined into the foundations of their faith and order, he united with them, and continued a faithful and zealous disciple of Christ until his death.

Bro. Mingus was possessed of fine native gifts as a preacher of the word. He was mighty in prayer and in exhortation. He was greatly beloved for his Christian walk; his strong and abiding faith in Christ; his earnest devotion to his cause; and for his liberality to the poor, and generous hospitality. In his family, in the church, and in the world, he was a consistent Christian. He died in the hope of immortality and eternal life through Christ. He was confined to his room for three months with cancer in the stomach, of which he died. I knew him well and loved him as a brother in Christ, and hope to meet him in "That house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." He leaves a wife, several children and numerous friends to mourn his absence, but they are assured that his end was peace.

J. C.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2 50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding - , -	25	Extra Cloth, - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edg s - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. V

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., JULY, 1870. [No. VII.

LETTERS FROM BRO. G. GREENWELL.

LETTER IX.

ANASTASIS.—OLD TESTAMENT.

The Professor states that the intimations in the Old Testament "do not distinguish very precisely, between the doctrine of the *resurrection*, technically so termed, and that of a future existence, or immortality. So far at least as the tenet of the resurrection is supposed necessarily to include the idea of the living again of the physical body, we shall probably look in vain for a single passage that unequivocally asserts it." Notwithstanding this, he grants that the doctrine of the resurrection "enters into the articles of the Jewish creed, and as their creed professedly rests upon the Old Testament alone, it would seem a problem difficult to be solved, whence their faith on this subject was derived, if not from the writings of Moses and the prophets." After an examination of the various words in Greek, Syriac and Hebrew, which signify resurrection, he grants that the usage of the words "is founded upon ideas drawn from visible objects and phenomena, and such as were appropriate to a general belief of the resurrection, the standing up again of the defunct body." But he still contends that usage is of little importance; that the truth of the doctrine is one thing—the Jewish construction another; and after this introduction, so damaging to his own cause, he proceeds to special passages.

Digitized by Google

I. Gen. xvii. 8—"And I will give unto thee and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God." On this context he quotes from Manasseh Ben Israel, who says: "It is plain that Abraham and the rest of the patriarchs did not possess that land; it follows therefore that they must be raised in order to enjoy the promised good, or otherwise the promises of God would be vain and false. Hence, therefore, is proved not only the immortality of the soul, but also the essential foundation of the law, to wit: the resurrection of the dead." The Professor grants that Bishop Meade, and writers of his school, put the same interpretation on the words, and he proceeds to say, first, that if his previous reasoning be sound, the body of Abraham can no more rise than any of the race; and second, that '*and*' is very often synonymous with *even*—to Abraham, *even* to his seed or representative. As to the *previous* reasoning, we have seen how much that was worth; and the hypothetical *even* is exploded by positive testimony elsewhere. See Ex. vi. 3, 4; Acts vii. 5. But this matter will revive again under New Testament consideration.

II. Job xix. 25-27—"For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and that though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God." Here he reasons that the Book of Job was not written by a Jew, or by one acquainted with the Messiah of promise; that Job is not mentioned in the New Testament as an example of *faith*, but of *patience*, nor reckoned among the prophets; and that the word translated Redeemer, may signify avenger, deliverer, vindicator, and that sight and vindication came in his own day (xlii. 5). Bush is not alone in remarks of this character; but they always appear trifling to me. Surely the faith of Job was the fountain of his patience; such a broad, clear river could only flow from that great well head. And as to Hebrew blood, that matters nothing; he was as much a Jew as Enoch, the seventh from Adam, and quite as likely to be instructed and grounded in living and definite hope. The standing on the earth in the latter day, and the sight of God the Redeemer in the flesh after the destruction of the body, are literalisms not easily vaporized by the chemistry of Rationalism.

III. Psa. xvi. 9, 10—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." Bush

Digitized by Google

remarks, "The fact of a resurrection is undoubtedly taught in these words; and yet from the inspired comment of Peter, Acts ii. 29-31, it is clear that it is a resurrection predicated of the body of Christ, and not of the bodies of men in general." The Professor might have remembered the inspired comment of Paul as well as of Peter, where the resurrection of Christ is taught as the foundation of the general doctrine. But this will arise again when we come to Cor. xv.

IV. Psa. xvii. 15—"I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." This the Professor thinks may describe "the transition of the disembodied spirit from earth to heaven at the moment of dissolution." This nonsense reminds me of Novalis, who said that "life was a disease of the spirit." It appears from Bush that the spirit only sleeps while imprisoned in this mortal tabernacle, but at death it awakes and soars on triumphal wings into the heavens, in the likeness of the Lord. All this romance comes to an end when we remember, first, that David, though dead, has *not* ascended into heaven; second, that no mere disembodied soul can wear the likeness of the glorified man, who is perfect in full-summed personality, body, soul and spirit.

V. Isa. xxv. 7, 8—"He will swallow up death in victory."—Here Bush concludes that death is not used in its ordinary acceptation; but Paul refut s this, for he quotes the saying and determines its meaning: "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory.'" This is undeniably the resurrection time, when the corruptible puts on incorruption, and the mortal puts on immortality. Bush replies to this, that such cannot be the meaning of Paul, unless it is the meaning of Isaiah, and he argues that Isaiah is setting before us one of the links in the great chain of events which are to distinguish the latter days of Zion's welfare, and that the last trump is merely the commencement of the ultimate bliss and glory of this world. There is truth in this; it is indeed the trumpet of life and hope, but is connected not with a shadowy but with a real resurrection. There is no obscurity either in the prophet or the apostle.

VI. Isa. xxvi. 19—"Thy dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead." The Professor sees here a national deliverance

Digitized by Google

from exile and bondage, and concludes that "my dead body" is a collective term for the restored mass of the Jewish nation. Tregelles, a more exact and more penetrating critic, confirms what Bush says about the absence of the words "together with," but his conclusion concerning "my dead body" is wonderfully different. "Thy dead men shall live: they shall arise: 'my dead body,'—such the words are literally,—identified with Christ awakening *his members*." Thus testifies Tregelles, in his work on Daniel. Hence, as the English critic intimates in the context, at the same time that the body of Christ is raised in immortal beauty, the dead men of Israel shall likewise arise, to blossom and bud and fill the face of the earth with cities. Might I not be permitted to say to the reader, that if he has leisure, he could not have a finer or more solemn study than the magnificent, continuous prophecy which begins with the xxivth and finishes with the xxviiith of Isaiah. The sounding of the trumpet, the punishment of the serpent, the convulsion of the earth, the rending of the veil, the resurrection of the dead, the banquet of life in the kingdom of God,—are all there painted in deathless coloring.

VII. Eze. xxxvii. On this context, to which the reader may turn, Bush argues that "The revivification of the dry bones is a symbol of the certain revival of the Jewish State by the restoration of the people to their own land." Those who know anything of me will easily understand that I have no objection to the restoration of the Jews to their own land, but on the contrary look on that event as a fact pregnant with salvation and glory to the nations. But it would have been poor consolation to the captives either in Babylon or elsewhere, merely to learn that in some remote age their polity would be restored, and their cities built again. Consolation could only spring from something in which they must share. The "all Israel" to be saved cannot be merely the living Hebrews at some given time, but (with individual exceptions on the score of enormous guilt and reprobation) must comprehend the people as a totality, as a race in their continuity. Hence the promises of God can only be fulfilled by literally bringing the people *out of their graves*, and the language in Ezekiel is as literal as elsewhere

VIII. Dan. xii. 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." Bush renders it, "And many

Digitized by Google

of the sleepers of the dust shall awake, these (the awakened) (shall be) to everlasting life; and those (the unawakened) (shall be) to shame and everlasting contempt." This accords with Aben Esra, and Tregelles gives the same rendering. But Bush begins to talk about an extended order of events stretching through a long lapse of centuries, to the time when Daniel is to stand in his lot at the end of his days, which is true enough; but men are not awaking from the dust of the earth *all the time.* The special text refers to what will transpire at the close of the period.

Bush grants that the words literally construed speak of physical resurrection, but regards the passage in the main "as a mere outward and sensible adumbration of a far more glorious work of moral quickening." His attempts at proof on this point, are something stupendous. 1st. Testimonies from the Rabbinical school. Sohar taught that in the world to come God would vivify the dead and raise them from the dust, so that they shall be no more of an earthly structure, but subsist as structures firm and durable. Saadias taught that dead Israelites are to be brought out of their graves in this world or age. I have a better opinion of the Rabbis than I had before; but where can Bush be travelling to? He proceeds, 2nd, to quote several passages where resurrection is *from* the dead, or from *out* the dead, which he correctly brings into harmony with the passage in Daniel. Had he argued from the splendid passages of this order, that there is a resurrection of life which has priority in time, and preeminence in grandeur, his foundations would have sustained such a conclusion. There are "Children of the Resurrection" who rise by moral necessity, and arise in regal power and glory because they belong to the Lord and King by spiritual union. Whereas the resurrection of the Godless, though a certainty, is merely a judicial act. But the conclusion of the Professor is most astonishing: "The proof, we believe, must be regarded as conclusive, that the passage in its more legitimate and primary import does *not* convey the idea of the resurrection of the body." The Lord be gracious to us and preserve to us the use of our reason! Take his argument in a *sort* of sorites,—

The literal words declare the resurrection of the body.

The Jews believed in the literal resurrection of the body, confining it to their own nation.

Digitized by Google

A number of passages declare the resurrection of the holy—only a part of the dead.

Ergo—*None* of the dead shall arise!

I fear that neither Aldrich nor Whately would acknowledge the conclusion. The Professor speaks in one place about the conspicuous divine wisdom as shown in the "*elasticity* of import in the language of the sacred volume;" but when we get fairly into the examination, the passages on this subject are by no means so *elastic* as he imagined them to be.

LIVERPOOL, England. G. GREENWELL.

REVISION OF THE ENGLISH SCRIPTURES.

It will be seen from the statement we publish below, that the Church of England is going to revise the common English Bible. For years many of the most eminent scholars and divines of that church, such as Tregelles, Trench, and Alford, have shown the absolute necessity of such a revision, and have called for it. even while the intense sect-feeling in America has made the distinguished and undistinguished divines here hold up their hands in pious horror at the thought of revising the English Bible;—revise all others, if you like, but not the English, not *ours*,—not the one used here by the English-speaking religious parties in America. This has always appeared to us very strange,—not inexplicable, it is true. Now, however, it seems the principle the friends of revision have been, for years, contending for,—the necessity, right and duty of English revision, as well as revision and correct translation in other tongues, is to be boldly carried out by the very mother of the Common Version herself,—the old church of England. Did not this Common Version seriously need revising, surely no such array of arrangements and scholarship would be brought forth. The friends of revision in America, so severely and persistently assailed and even maligned, are now justified in their plea, and the voice of sectarian opposition is severely rebuked. It is curious to notice how quietly and respectfully the announcement we print below is published in our religious and secular press,—in the very papers that savagely fell upon every, even the best, manifestation of revision in America. We are speaking now of the plea for revision. "There is no need of any

Digitized by Google

revision!" was the loud cry everywhere. Now, what is to be said when the church of England whose work the old version is, declares so boldly and emphatically *her* conviction of the need of revision, and proceeds, at once, with such pomp and circumstance of arrangement and learning, to carry out this conviction? Silence profund!

The plea against the American enterprise was, that it was a "sectarian translation." This was the constant cry. But what have we here? What kind of a work is this? Here we have the church of England alone moving, planning, and executing the revision. We have been looking over the papers in which we find the statement published, and which were, and yet are, wont to speak the loudest about "sectarian translation," to see an outcry of the same sort against this church of England movement;—but not a word! This is curious, really. The fact is, in religion, everything is sectarian that does not please and praise us. This church of England commission of revision may invite dissenter scholars, but the work is hers, still.

Now, it will of course, be not at all likely that these English divines and scholars will give us a revision that will, in any wise, damage the church of England, in doctrine or ritual. It is very doubtful whether *easter* and *bishop*, and such terms, are to be abolished, and uniformity in these words maintained in the translation, in harmony with the original. There is no hope of such a thing, not to speak of more important matters. It will be a church-of-England Bible, as near as it can be kept so,—no doubt in harmony with the true convictions of the divines and scholars that constitute the commission.

We have many reasons to rejoice at this movement in the English church. The revision, when it comes, will not be a thorough one, such as the truth demands, but it will doubtless be a great improvement. The spell will then be broken, and the world will not allow the good work of giving the Word of God in its purity to the English world, to rest. C. L. L.

"PROPOSED REVISION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

"The convention of the Church of England, the highest ecclesiastical body in Great Britain, last year appointed a committee to consider the subject of revising the authorized English version

Digitized by Google

of the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures. That committee last month made the following report:

"'1. That it is desirable that a revision of the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken.

"'2. That the revision be so conducted as to comprise both marginal renderings and such emendations as it may be found necessary to insert in the text of the authorized version.

"'3. That in the above resolutions we do not contemplate any new translation of the Bible or any alteration of the language, except where, in the judgment of the most competent scholars, such change is necessary.

"'4. That in such necessary changes, the style of the language employed in the existing version be closely followed.

"'5. That it is desirable that Convocation should nominate a body of its own members to undertake the work of revision, who shall be at liberty to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong.'

"This report was adopted, and the following resolutions were then passed, setting forth the manner in which the revision is to be conducted:

"I. That the committee appointed by the Convocation of Canterbury at its last session separate itself into two companies, the one for the revision of the authorized version of the Old Testament, the other for the revision of the authorized version of the New Testament.

"II. That the company for the revision of the authorized version of the Old Testament consist of the Bishops of St. David's, Llandaff, Ely, Lincoln and Bath and Wells, and of the following members from the Lower House: Archdeacon Rose, Canon Selwyn, Dr. Jebb and Dr. Kay.

"III. That the company for the revision of the authorized version of the New Testament consist of the Bishops of Winchester, Gloucester and Bristol, and Salisbury, and of the following members from the Lower House: The Prolocutor, the Deans of Canterbury and Westminster, and Canon Blakesly.

"IV. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the Old Testament Company be the revision of the authorized version of the Pentateuch.

"V. That the first portion of the work to be undertaken by the New Testament Company be the revision of the authorized version of the Synoptical Gospels.

"VI. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join

Digitized by Google

the Old Testament Company: Dr. W. L. Alexander, Professor Chinnery, Canon Cook, Professor A. B. Davidson, Dr. B. Davies, Professor Fairbairn, Rev. F. Field, Dr. Ginsburg, Dr. Gotch, Archdeacon Harrison, Professor Leathes, Professor McGill, Canon Payne Smith, Prof. J. H. Perowne, Professor Plumptre, Canon Pusey, Dr. Wright (British Museum), W. A. Wright (Cambridge).

"VII. That the following scholars and divines be invited to join the New Testament Company: Dr. Angus, the Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Eadie, Rev. F. J. A. Hort, Rev. W. G. Humphrey, Canon Kennedy, Archdeacon Lee, Dr. Lightfoot, Prof. Milligan, Prof. Moulton, Dr. J. H. Newman, Prof. Newth, Dr. A. Roberts, Rev. G. Vance Smith, Dr. Scott (Balliol College), Rev. F. Scrivener, Dr. Vaughn and Canon Westcott.

"VIII. That the general principles to be followed by both companies be as follows:

"1. To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the authorized version consistently with faithfulness.

"2. To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the authorized and earlier English versions.

"3. Each company to go twice over the portion to be revised, once provisionally, the second time finally, and on principles of voting as hereinafter is provided.

"4. That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating, and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the authorized version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.

"5. To make or retain no change in the text on the second final revision by each company, except two-thirds of those present approve of the same, but on the first revision to decide by simple majorities.

"6. In every case of proposed alteration that may have given rise to discussion, to defer the voting thereupon till the next meeting, whensoever the same shall be required by one-third of those present at the meeting, such intended vote to be announced in the notice for the next meeting.

"7. To revise the headings of chapters, pages, paragraphs, italics and pronunciation.

"8. To refer, on the part of each company, when considered desirable, to divines, scholars and literary men, whether at home or abroad, for their opinions.

"IX. That the work of each company be communicated to the

Digitized by Google

other as it is completed, in order that there may be as little deviation from uniformity in language as possible.

"X. That the special or by-rules for each company be as follows;

"1. To make all corrections in writing previous to the meeting.

"2. To place all corrections due to textual considerations on the left hand margin, and all other corrections on the right hand margin.

"3. To transmit to the chairman, in case of being unable to attend, the corrections proposed in the portion agreed upon for consideration.'

"When the revision is completed it will require the assent of the Crown before it can be officially adopted and read in the Episcopal churches in England.

"This consent will doubtless be withheld until the revised section shall have been examined and approved by a royal commission of conservative scholars. Even apart from this, there is no likelihood of any important changes being accepted by the bishops and clergymen to whom the work is given; but this additional check makes it certain that the authorized English Bible will be substantially preserved as it now stands."

BAPTISM, COMMUNION, SALVATION.

It is evident to any one conversant with the New Testament that baptism sustains a certain definite relation both to communion and salvation; and it is truly amazing to see the various conflicting views and theories on these subjects entertained by men of learning and ability, confessedly deriving their knowledge from the same source. But contradictory conclusions from the same premises demonstrably prove error in the reasoning somewhere, so that the conclusions are not to be received on trust because they happen to be the deductions of men of high literary culture.

As an example of Mr. Armstrong's reasonings in reference to the "perplexing question" as to how Jesus was baptized, I presented, some months since, a few extracts from his book entitled, "The Bible against Close Communion." After disposing of this question he proceeds to consider the subject of exclusive immersion and its relation to communion, evidently with a view of ren-

Digitized by Google

dering the Baptist practice as objectionable as possible. He says:

"The doctrine of close communion is based on two points, both of which are presumed to be infallibly true. First, That immersion is the only infallible mode of Christian baptism.—Second, That those *only* who are immersed, give evidence of being real Christians, true followers of Christ. Now if these two affirmative propositions are infallibly true, then, all who thus believe, to be consistent, must also believe and practice close communion."

Again. "It is averred that all professed evangelical Baptists inflexibly hold the following to be Bible doctrines:

1, That immersion is the only scriptural mode of baptism.

2, That none but those who are baptized by immersion are true followers of Christ.

3, That all true followers of Christ and none others of mankind, have a right to the communion-table of the Lord Jesus Christ.

"Now, on the most critical review of the foregoing connected propositions, it must be admitted that *if* the Baptists are right in the *first* proposition of the train, they are right in the second and third, and all arguments to prove the contrary must be futile and vain. Thus much must be conceded to the Baptists. But such a concession amounts to nothing in their favor, if the first proposition is not true, but false. And if the three propositions are infallibly true, another proposition must unavoidably be added as infallible truth, which must inevitably overthrow the whole system of the Baptists' theory of denominational existence.

4, Affirmative proposition. *Immersion is essential to salvation.*

"This doctrine is infallible if the three foregoing affirmative propositions are true."

These propositions are held up, turned over, repeated, and re-repeated, commented on, illustrated, demonstrated and compounded, intermingled with redundant expressions, strong adjectives and adverbs through several pages, to show that the second, third and fourth "infallibly" flow from the first. With great assurance does Mr. Armstrong announce the result of his reasonings in these words, "No demonstration can be more certain and infallible than the conclusion drawn from the foregoing compound proposition [the four united], the sum total of which is reduced to a sentence, namely, that if *immersion* is the *only* scriptual

Digitized by Google

mode of Christian baptism, then immersion is positively and infallibly essential to salvation." Also in another place he says, "If it be admitted that immersion is the only scriptural mode of Christian baptism, then demonstration proves infallibly that immersion is essential to salvation, and all the power of logic may be challenged to disprove it."

It is manifest that the object of the writer of these extracts was, to bring discredit upon immersion as the only baptism, by associating with it a position which was odious to the Baptists as well as to himself. But his logical acumen did not oblige him to consider that there are two ways of escaping his design. Knowing the firmness with which the Baptists hold on to their views of the "mode" of baptism, he should have inquired whether they would not be more likely to admit the fourth proposition, than to deny the first. Certainly this seems to me the more probable. Hence instead of disproving "exclusive immersion," he was only proving to them from their own premises that he himself could not be saved unless he be immersed. Feeling too well assured of the correctness of their premises to relinquish them, the Baptists could but accept his conclusion, and would exhort him to be immersed by all means, and *be saved.* It would certainly greatly increase the popular estimate of immersion and add force and pertinency to the exhortation to sinners to yield to it, could they only be persuaded that it was *necessary* to their salvation.

The other way of escape open to the Baptists, is to deny the "infallibility" of the reasonings, which they would most likely do, since they reject the fourth proposition. They will not find this method less effectual in evading the force of Mr. Armstrong's logic than the other, for there is a link lacking which I presume neither he nor they would be willing to supply. Very confidently does he affirm the "infallible" sequence of immersion as being essential to salvation, from the hypothesis that immersion is the only scriptural baptism. But this inference can be justified only on the ground that *baptism* is essential to salvation, which it is presumed both he and the Baptists would persist in denying.—But this being admitted, and it being asserted that immersion is essential to baptism, it would follow that immersion is essential to salvation.

Similarly it may be said that the second and third propositions do not follow from the first unless it be admitted that baptism is

Digitized by Google

essential to a true follower of Christ, and precedent to communion. No attempt is made to refute the arguments usually advanced in support of "exclusive immersion," but simply to destroy confidence in them from their supposed consequences.—Great confidence is placed in the reasoning. Had it been asserted that baptism is necessary to be a true follower of Christ, to communion and to salvation, we would be glad to give the author credit for sound logic, and rejoice in his testimony to the consistency of the Baptists in regarding none but the immersed as the true followers of Christ, and the only rightful participants at the Lord's table, The logical connection of the first and fourth proposition would also be established, though of no practical value unless it be proved or admitted that baptism is essential to salvation. As it is, however, this testimony is of little consequence, being defective in reasoning since it asserts a conclusion, yet denies (we presume) one of the premises from which it is inferred.

The book containing the extract cited, is approved and quite highly commended by six Presbytarian pastors, two Dutch Reformed, one Congregational, and one Methodist, who had an opportunity of examining the manuscript in advance of publication. They do not find fault with the reasoning. Says one, "In the judgment of the undersigned, it seems impracticable, if not impossible, to overthrow the positions assumed and arguments employed. They challenge the contradiction of all without the hazard of refutation." "In this I concur with all my heart," says another. A third says, "The work is timely; it is eminently calculated, by its clear, logical arrangment and scriptural argument, to produce conviction and awaken solemn reflection. As a *vindication* of the practice of Pedobaptist churches it is complete and instructive." "My impression is that the argument is ably and candidly conducted," says a fourth. Still another: "We think the publication of this work will be well timed, and may possibly serve to sober the senses of some, and enlighten the minds of others. There is throughout a directness of logical remark, and energetic closeness of pursuit, which impart to the reader all the animation of the *chase.* Although some may complain that the Baptist is impolitely pulled, and pushed, and shoved about, it must be remembered that he *more impolitely* has made the onset. All orthodox Baptist authors unchurch every denomination but their own. Mr. Armstrong has simply tried upon them the force of their own *ramrod arguments.*"

Digitized by Google

Concerning this, Baptist authors are competent to speak for themselves. As for myself, I should not object much to being even "*impolitely* pulled and pushed and shoved about," if it were found necessary to get a full presentation of my opponent's strongest argument. It is the *argument* that we want. We are willing to accept its results or show its invalidity. Those ten pastors have committed themselves to Mr. Armstrong's logic. Had I the opportunity, I would be glad to say to them, that many who are dead have believed, and many now living do still believe, that immersion is necessary to true discipleship, precedent to communion and essential to salvation, on the ground that immersion is essential to baptism, and baptism essential to discipleship, communion and salvation *according to the gospel.* Denying this last position invalidates the argument; while affirming it, establishes it. Hence another mode of argumentation is necessary to determine the truth of the Baptist position.

Mr. Armstrong very pertinently asks, 1, "Ought not the qualifications for communion be such as are essential to salvation?" 2. "Do not the Baptists exclude from their communion-table real Christians [persons whom they conclude to be real Christians], because they have not been immersed?" 3. "If so, on what ground do they deny that immersion is essential to salvation?" The first question evidently requires an affirmative answer. Says the celebrated Robert Hall, "There should be no terms of communion but what are terms of salvation; the man who is good enough for Christ, is good enough for me." Baptists and Pedobaptists are alike inconsistent in making baptism essential to communion, and not essential to salvation. To be consistent, shall we make baptism—immersion—essential to salvation, or non-essential to communion? What say ye, Baptists? W. W. HAYDEN.

THE LAW OF DIVORCE.

In my letter published in the May No. of the HARBINGER I affirmed the following propositions,—

First, That those outside could not obey the law of Christ, and further, that no law of Christ, save the law of naturalization, was given to any but the church.

Second, That the law laid down in Matt. xix. 9, only applied to cases where both husband and wife were Christians.

Digitized by Google

I closed by asking what Paul meant in I Cor. vii. 15, by saying, "A brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases."

I have read Bro. C. L. L.'s reply carefully a number of times and have failed to discover whether he agrees with me in my first proposition, or not. On page 269 he says, "An unbeliever, or non-Christian, cannot obey the whole law of Christ, because there are things in it peculiar to the Christian state, which a man only *as a Christian* can perform. He cannot obey the law of Christ as such, for he is not under it, does not recognize it, and has not the spirit of Christ, that legitimates and sanctifies such acts of obedience." That is what I mean by my first proposition, that a non-Christian "cannot obey the law of Christ as such, *for he is not under it*," &c. If this is correct, my second proposition follows as a matter of course, for it is a part of the first and must stand or fall with it.

Brother C. L. L. appears alarmed at the above admission, and on 270, 271 and 272, he condemns it as giving "free license so far as divine law is concerned,"—

It is never best to confound thing. The moral law of God is co-extensive with the human family, "*Lie not, steal not, murder not, obey the powers that be, as good citizens, honor the king,*" was a part of the law of God, ages before Christ and his apostles made it a law of the church.

To do away with the force of my argument that the law in Matt. xix. 9 applies only to Christians, brother C. L. L. argues on page 268, that what Christ said in Matt. xix. 4, 5, and 6 verses, was not a law of Christ or even of Moses, but existed from the beginning. I concede it. I referred to the 9th verse, which was not a law from the beginning, neither was it in the law of Moses, but Christ announced it for the first time. It is an error to suppose that Christ restored the law as it was in Eden. The law in Eden did not permit a man to put away his wife for adultery, neither did it allow him to marry at the death of his wife. The Savior referred to the law in the beginning to show the Jews how far they had fallen. "What God has joined together let no man put asunder," is a law co-extensive with the human family. I have never said anything to the contrary; but I fear brother C. L. L. and I differ as to what constitutes putting asunder.—When a man leaves his wife, with the avowed intention of a perpetual separation, and persists in such a course, *he* has put *her*

Digitized by Google

away. This is what I understand Paul to mean when he says, "if the unbelieving depart." After a man puts his wife away, it is impossible for her to put him away.

The reason why the Savior allowed of putting away for but one cause was because all other difficulties can be compromised, but adultery, never.

To prove that the law in Matt. xix. 9 is confined to cases where both husband and wife are Christians, I quoted from 1 Cor. vii. 12, where Paul says that the Lord did not speak to those cases where but one was a believer. Bro. C. L. L. skipped my argument altogether and claimed that Paul was not inspired in what he said to those who had partners that believed not. It is immaterial to my argument whether Paul was inspired in what he said or not. The fact remains. Paul said the Lord did *not* speak to such cases, but if the law in Matt. xix. 9, applies to the whole world, the Lord *did* speak, for the greater always includes the less.

Bro. C. L. L. thinks "the difficulties in the case of those intermarried with unbelievers, are not, from any intimation given, the same as in the previous case between believers." See I Cor. vii. 10–15. Both cases refer to any difficulties which caused, or were likely to cause separations. Bro. C. L. L. interpolates the 15th verse. Paul says, "If the unbelieving depart, a brother or sister is not under bondage in such cases." Bro. C. L. L. says, If the unbelieving depart, *because the believer is a Christian*, &c. It is not in the original and it destroys the sense. If the unbeliever departs, *because the believer is a Christian*, a brother or sister is not under bondage, but if the unbeliever departs *for any other cause*, a brother or sister is under bondage still. The sense is still further marred by brother C. L. L.'s explanation of the phrase, "not under bondage." In the first case the believer is to allow him to depart, but in the second case the believer is not to allow him to depart, but how she is to stop him we are not informed.

If anything was needed to convince me that the entire New Testament, every chapter and verse, is inspiration, this is enough. A good man, a Christian, unlocks the inspired volume and puts in six words, and what was before intelligible becomes a tissue of absurdity.

"A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases."—Bro. C. L. L. says, "interpreters are not settled as to whether this means that the abandoned may marry again or not." If in-

Digitized by Google

terpreters *cannot* tell, the Corinthians *could* not tell, and Paul either did not know what he wanted to say or else did not understand the Greek language well enough to say what he meant.

I understand the bondage spoken of to be the marriage bond and if the unbeliever put away his wife by leaving her, he broke the marriage bond and she was free (not under bondage) to marry again.

The "grave questions" on page 272 refute themselves, and if they have any weight, it is against the Savior. Did he mean "that a husband is to be allowed, * * * * all other wrongs *except adultery*, toward his wife, and that she cannot break the bonds" till he has reached the climax of infidelity? Bro. C. L. L.'s explanation of verse 14th does not harmonize with his first argument on page 268. He says—I give the meaning—that the marriage relation between the believing and unbelieving is a holy one, because the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, &c. If both are unbelievers the relation must be unholy; yet, on page 268, he claims that it is holy without reference to whether the parties are Jews, Christians, or Gentile heathen.

*

From the British Quarterly Review.

THE PLACE WHERE LIGHT DWELLETH.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 315.)

Fascinating, however, as this theory may be, it is right to remember that it is looked upon by many as little more than a scientific castle in the air. There is no proof that meteors are shot down upon the sun in such profusion and with such wonderful regularity, as to keep the great central furnace in "full blast."—Many points of difficulty will, of course, arise. If, for example, our luminary is thus incessantly pelted, he must be constantly augmenting in substance; and in a system so delicately adjusted as ours, will not this continual addition of matter disturb the balance of forces, and eventually lead to the destruction of the whole? To this it is replied that the increase must be so slight in comparison with the solar mass, that no change measurable by human instruments, or perceptible by human organs, can possibly have

Digitized by Google

ensued; and further, since the sun's current expenditure of radiant force is assumed to be balanced by his income of fuel, there must be compensating principles at work which will keep his accounts "on the square." Just in proportion, for example, as his heat is dissipated, so his volume should contract, and it is not an unpardonable supposition, when dealing with an agent of which we know so little as gravity, that even this mystic power may be affected by conditions too subtle or too remote for our present comprehension.

The existence of the zodiacal light has sometimes been quoted in corroboration of this theory. What is this luminous phantom, shaped like a cone, which is best seen on the horizon after the sun, when he sets in the spring of the year, or before him when he rises in the autumn? Part of his atmosphere, it was commonly said. Or, might it not consist of cometary and meteoric material which, growing denser as the distance from the focus of gravity decreased, became visible as a solar appendage? To use the eloquent words of Professor Tyndall, "the entire mass constituting the zodiacal light must be constantly approaching, and incessantly raining its substance upon the sun." Not long ago, however, the spectroscope was brought upon this magnificent apparition, and Angstrom found that instead of exhibiting faint bands of color, as it should if it shone by reflected solar light, it yielded only one bright line, and that the very line which figures most conspicuously in the spectrum of our own aurora borealis. What renders this coincidence more striking is, that the bright streak in question does not appear to answer to any ascertained spectral element. And to add to the interest of the discovery, similar indications have been obtained from the corona of the sun during a late total eclipse, so that, as Mr. Proctor has recently pointed out, a curious relationship is found to exist between the zodiacal display, the solar crown, the terrestrial streamers, and probably the tails of comets. From this fact alone, however, we are scarcely entitled to infer that the sun is surrounded by a dense swarm of meteoric masses, ever thickening as we approach his vicinity; indeed, the variable demeanor of the phantom in question seems to intimate (what we suspect is the solution of its character) that it is an electrical phenomenon produced by the play of the electrical fluid in matter of an extremely attenuated description attached to the sun. At any hour, however, discoveries may

Digitized by Google

be made which will do much to clear up this as well as other ancient puzzles of the sky. *

Another attempt to account for the sun's high temperature ascribes it to the domestic operations of gravity. Assuming that this body represents matter which originally existed in a state of great diffusion, the process of condensation round a central point would necessarily be attended by a disengagement of heat. Looking at the operation simply under its mechanical aspect, the moving of the particles towards the nucleus, and the clashings and collisions thus produced, would raise a capital of caloric, upon the doctrine of transmuted motion, presumably sufficient to establish the sun in business as manager of a planetary system. To many persons indeed such a statement will appear perfectly incredible; or, if they admit that the primary stock of heat may be thus explained, they will insist that the theory makes no provision for subsequent supplies. But the effect of further condensation must not be forgotten. It has been computed by Helmholtz that the contraction of the sun's diameter to the extent of a single thousandth would "squeeze" out as much force as would balance all the heat and light he will squander for the next twenty thousand years.

One other theory deserves passing mention, not, indeed, from its intrinsic merit, but from its gay defiance of all consistency. The sun's warmth is renewed by *friction*. In rotating on its axis the orb brushes against the surrounding medium—the presumed ether of space—and this process occasions a continual discharge of heat, and even of light. But granting as we may the existence of such a medium, and admitting that it was of sufficient density to produce any noticable amount of friction, should not the same principle be applicable to each planet, especially to the rapid revolvers like Saturn and Jupiter, who spin round on their axes, the former in little more, and the latter in little less, than ten hours; and, consequently, ought not each of these bodies to be called a little sun, after its own humble rushlight fashion? Or if it be supposed that the ether is much denser in the vicinity of the solar orb by reason of his commanding gravity, just so much more readily will his motion be retarded, just so much more speedily

* Professor Balfour Stewart seems disposed to regard the red flames or protuberances, respecting which so much has recently been said, as auroral exhibitions in the upper solar atmosphere.

Digitized by Google

will his light and caloric be exhausted, and the poor luminary must eventually be brought to a complete halt by the application of this subtle empyreal "break." Mayer, indeed, calculated that, giving to this rotary movement all the effect that could be fairly ascribed to it, it could not, if wholly converted into heat, keep the sun in stock for more than 183 years.

But if the limits of human observation are too narrow to afford us the opportunity of detecting any decline in our imports of caloric, may we not at any rate draw some conclusions respecting the manners and customs of suns by studying their behavior on a large scale—that is, by noting whatever alterations may appear in some of the myriads which sparkle in the sky? Now, there are notoriously stars which wax and wane, stars which flame up conspicuously and then subside into insignificance, and stars, too, which suddenly start into view and then vanish apparently for ever. To explain these peculiarities, it has been supposed that the body thus affected may present a dark and a luminous side alternately, or that its native brightness may be obscured by the intervention of some opaque companion, or that instead of being spherical, its form may be such as to exhibit at one time a full face and at another a mere profile or silhouette, or that in consequence of some great convulsion the orb may really be inundated with fire, and finally go out after suffering all the agonies of a terrible conflagation. In sundry cases, too, stars are supposed to have undergone certain alterations of color, and these may be indicative of alterations in their luminous force. Since then there are, and have been, many examples of these changeable suns in the heavens, it is a possible thing that our own master orb may be subject to similar contingencies, and destined to experience analagous vicissitudes? Courage! however, suggests M. Guillemin:—

"We can sleep quietly,—we and the generations that will follow us,—during thousands of centuries. Our supply of heat and of light is assured for a future of which we cannot measure the duration. Whatever then be the fraction of that time which yet remains for us to live, we can, without fear of being mistaken, measure it also by millions of years. The end of the world by the cooling and extinction of the sun is far from us."

In speaking of our sources of heat, however, some little qualification is required. It is but an act of justice to other suns to remember that we owe something to them, small and insensible as

Digitized by Google

the debt may at first appear. Swift was scarcely correct when he wrote—

> "Stars beyond a certain height,
> Give mortals neither heat nor light."

From every part of the heavens caloric may be said to be trickling down upon the earth, for each orb must be radiating its bright influences into space incessantly. Mr. Huggins and also Mr. Stone have made direct experiments upon the heating capabilities of certain stars, and the latter gentleman ascertained that Arcturus produced an effect equal to that which would be derived from the face of a Leslie cube filled with boiling water, and placed at a distance of 383 yards, whilst α Lyræ threw out as much warmth as would be represented by a similar cube at a distance of 860 yards. Small as these individual issues may appear, it is something to know that thousands of orbs are sending us their subsidies of caloric. It seems difficult to believe that those calm cold-looking stars, with their icy glitter, should cast out any thermal rays which would produce the smallest appreciable effect upon our broad acres or deep foggy atmosphere, particularly as Pouillet fixed the temperature of space at 110 degrees below zero. But paradoxical though it may seem, he computed that whilst the sun by his proper force communicates to our globe annually (that is, actually delivers *here*) sufficient heat to melt a shell of ice 31 metres in depth, the stars and space afford us as much more as would fuse a shell of 26 metres! It has even been affirmed that if, during the hours of night and the wintry season of the year, we were deprived of this unostentatious supply—this low-toned and obscure caloric, as it might be called—our own radiations into space would be so exhausting that the sun itself would scarcely be able to carry on the business of vitality in the planet.

One question cannot fail to present itself here. Is there any reason to suppose that the sun will ever run out of light, that it will ever become bankrupt in heat? It is impossible to imagine anything more prodigal of his treasures than the "informer of the planetary train." He pours out his beams above, below, around; by night as fluently as by day; and upon the wastes of the universe as freely as upon the most crowded tracts of creation.

He is such a spendthrift of his splendors that he would shine on if every planet were as barren of life as the moon, or as filmy

Digitized by Google

in substance as the comet. But surely, think we, this reckless expenditure of energy must tell upon his exchequer, and some symptoms of decline, if not of future exhaustion, might be expected to appear?

Not, indeed, that there is such a thing as the absolute destruction of force. Upon modern principles, as we have seen, it is simply transmuted, never extinguished. But it would afford us, daily pensioners upon the bounty of the sun, scanty comfort to know that the solar energies might be dispersed over the universe without a single particle being actually lost. That which concentrated in one central body is capable of vivifying a whole family of worlds, would not possess sufficient potency to maintain a cabbage garden, were it parceled out amongst myriads of stars; just as the annual revenue which enables an empire to fill every sea with its ships and every land with tokens of its power, would neither support a single pauper, nor make an appreciable addition to a rich man's pocket-money, if equally distributed amongst its inhabitants.

There is, of course, no mode by which the question of declining energy can be accurately determined. It is imppossible to say from mere human testimony whether the sun possessed a whit more photographic power a thousand years ago than he does now, or whether his beams played with more ardor upon the painted hides of the ancient Britons than they do upon the highly accoutred forms of their more polished successors. Changes of climate have undoubtedly occurred on our globe, and many vicissitudes of temperature are geologically recorded in our rocks; but it is needless to state that these are not due to any unsteadiness on the part of the sun.

Still, if a man is spending his fortune at a given rate per annum, and we know of no outward sources from which it can be renewed, it might be possible to hazard a guess at the longest period for which it would last. We should, of course, have to conjecture what his capital now is, or what it might have been when his spendthrift career commenced. According to the calculations of Herschel and Pouillet, says Professor Thomson, in a remarkable memoir on the "Age of the Sun's Heat," that body "radiates every year from his whole surface about 6×10^{33} (six million, million, million, million, million) times as much heat as is sufficient to raise the temperature of 1 lb. of water by 1 degree

Digitized by Google

Cent." Assuming that the mean specific heat* of the solar mass were equal to the specific heat of water (this liquid being about the greatest devourer of caloric upon our earth) the rate of cooling deduced from the above computation would be 1 degree Cent. and 4-10ths of a degree per annum. For certain reasons Sir W. Thomson regards it as highly probable that the sun's specific heat is more than ten times and less than 10,000 times that of the fluid in question. "From this it would follow with certainty that his temperature sinks 100 degrees Cent. in some time from 700 years to 700,000 years." Pouillet, estimating the specific heat of our luminary at 133 times that of water, infers that he is expending his warmth at the rate of one degree Cent. in a century. Small as this may appear, it must be considered that in 6,000 years it would amount to a decline of 60 degrees (= 108 Fah.), which comprehends as great a range of temperature as lies between an African summer with its sudden sunstrokes, or an arctic zero with its stealthy frostbites. Reasoning, however, upon the supposition that the sun's caloric was acquired from the fall and coalition of smaller bodies under the constraints of gravity, Sir W. Thomson concludes that we may accept

"as a lowest estimate for the sun's initial heat 10,000,000 times a year's supply at the present rate, but 50,000,000 or 100,000,000 as possible in consequence of the sun's greater density in his central parts. The considerations adduced above in this paper regarding the sun's possible specific heat, rate of cooling, and superficial temperature, render it probable that he must have been very sensibly warmer one million years ago than now, and, consequently, that if he has existed as a luminary for ten or twenty million years, he must have radiated away considerably more than the corresponding number of times the present yearly amount of loss. It seems, therefore, on the whole, most probable that the sun has not illuminated the earth for 100,000,000 years, and almost certain he has not done so for 500,000,000 years. As for the future, we may say with equal certainty that the inhabitants of the earth

* Specific heat is the quantity of caloric (if we may speak of such a force quantatively) which a given substance absorbs or stows away—hides, as it were, in itself in a latent form—whilst passing from one degree of temperature to another. To raise one body a single degree requires more or less heat than another; hence its capacity is said to be large or small.

Digitized by Google

cannot continue to enjoy the light and heat essential to their life for many million years longer unless sources now unknown to us are prepared in the great storehouse of creation."

But this glorious orb, bright and unsullied as it seems to the untutored eye, is by no means stainless. On the contrary, its countenance is rarely free from blotches. One day toward the beginning of the seventeenth century a Dutch observer, Fabricius, whilst eying the sun with a telescope, was struck by the appearance of a speck of considerable dimensions. What could it be? A cloud, was his first surmise; but as it was impossible to continue his inspection long for want of a fitting mode of moderating the solar radiance, he and his father were compelled to postpone their scrutiny till the next day. Impatiently they retired to rest, indulging in many a curious speculation as to the nature of the phenomenon. Eagerly they arose; and, on scanning the sun's disc, there was the mysterious intruder, slightly changed in position, and still more slightly changed in form. Great, however, was the chagrin of the worthy pair when three days of untoward weather intercepted their view of the sun. But, this passed, the apparition was not only found to have advanced some distance towads the western rim, but a smaller spot had emerged on the eastern border, and in a few days this was followed by a third. All were evidently in full march across the solar field, and all successively disappeared. Between the hope of seeing them again and the fear of losing them for ever, poor Fabricius was kept in a state of considerable agitation, and therefore it was with inconceivable pleasure that, after the lapse of some days, he saw the first of them spring up again on the eastern margin of the luminary. Then he knew, either that the objects in question must have made a complete revolution round the sun like little planets, or, that the sun itself, as Bruno and Kepler had suspected, possessed a rotary motion of its own.

Now these spots have been the subject of much study in recent years, not only on account of their interest as solar eccentricities, but because it was expected that a correct understanding of their character would throw much light on the sun's constitution.—Specks as they seem, their movements have been followed and their changes mapped down with an attention which might seem exaggerated if we looked upon them simply as a Lunarian might upon the clouds floating in our own atmosphere. In this coun-

Digitized by Google

try, Mr. Carrington, who has published the results of his telescopic rambles in the spotted regions, in a splendid volume, stands conspicuous; and Messrs. Warren de la Rue, Professor Balfour Stuart, and Mr. Loewy, who have devoted much time and thought to the same subject, have given (and the word must be taken in its literal sense) the fruits of their labors to the public in a series of valuable papers on Solar Physics.

If we imagine ourselves to be standing at some distance from a terrestrial globe, and regard the large islands which speckle the tropical seas as sun spots, we shall notice changes of aspect due entirely to the rotation of the sphere, if slowly and equably performed. Take Madagascar, for example. The island, on emerging from the "wooden horizon," would appear to move somewhat tardily, but would proceed more rapidly as it approached the "brass meridian;" this passed, it would slacken its pace gradually until it dipped into darkness on the other side. The reason is obvious. The motion, in the first place, is partly lost to us because the object is traveling in a measure toward the eye: in the central portions it is more fully displayed, because the object is traveling athwart the field of vision, whilst in receding, these conditions are reversed, and the pace appears, therefore, to be retarded. Then, too, it was observed, in studying the blots on the sun, that when there were several in sight, they generally took similar paths—tracing, as it were, parallel or concentric lines, like lines of latitude across his disc. Just so, we need scarcely say, the islands on our globe would appear to move in corresponding routes, the curvature being dependent upon the inclination of the pole to the plane of vision. Some specks there are, however, which seem to be endowed with a mobility of their own; for, unlike their island representatives here, they are occasionally observed to vary their distances from each other; one mentioned by M. Langier retreating from a neighbor at the rate of 111 metres per second. The proper motion of the spots, which follows a regular law of increase in proportion to their proximity to the equator, is found to be opposed in direction to that of the sun's rotation.

But these objects do not present themselves at random over the dazzling disc. They affect certain latitudes and eschew others.—Even early observers of the phenomenon did not fail to notice that they rarely ventured out of a belt of 30 degrees on each side

Digitized by Google

of the solar equator, which for that reason was designated the "royal zone." In a few instances, indeed, stragglers have been seen in much higher latitudes, and one very lonely and exceptional individual was discovered by La Hire as far north as 70 degrees. But, strange to say, they shun the equator itself almost as much as they do the polar circles. Out of 954 groups observed by Mr. Carrington, one only lay across the line; in four degrees on either side specimens were thinly scattered, whilst in the belts comprehended between the 10th and 30th degrees (the northern hemisphere, however, being more preferred than the southern) they appeared with such frequency, that it is obvious these must be regarded as their favorite promenades.

The most significant feature, however, about these objects is their general construction. They are not of uniform hue, but in and towards the center there is a dark part called the umbra or nucleus, and round it there runs a grayish or more gently shaded portion known as the penumbra, the shape of the latter being dictated, in a great measure, by that of the former, just as the fringing round an island on our artificial globe adapts itself to the contour of the island itself. This typical form, however, admits of many variations, and is rarely realized in its perfect simplicity. There may be two or three or more black nuclei; the penumbra may seem to be quite out of proportion to the central parts; the outer lines may be ragged and destitute of anything like true conformity; here we may have an eccentric specimen without any dark core, and there another which has dispensed entirely with its shaded appendage. Not unfrequently the gloom of the black abyss in the center (so imagination might deem it) is relieved by bright streaks or patches, and sometimes it is spanned by lines or arches of light, which Herschel happily described as "luminous bridges." Occasionally the penumbra has a striped or corrugated appearance, which has been compared, by another felicitous illustration, to the slopes surrounding a lake when furrowed by the beds of innumerable streams.

But whatever may be the shape the spot assumes, it undergoes certain changes, some of which are optical, some internal. When first detected on the eastern border (telescopically viewed) the visitor looks like a line or a streak; as it advances it assumes an oval configuration; at the center it attains its greatest rotundity, and then it passes through reverse transformations before it runs

Digitized by Google

off the opposite edge. Precisely similar changes would appear in our Madagascar, making allowance for its oblong contour, if surveyed from a distance during a half revolution of the globe. The internal alterations are, of course, more capricious. The dark core may expand, but usually the penumbra seems to invade the nucleus, and divide it into portions, or overflow it entirely, gradually vanishing itself in turn. Occasionally patches break up with great rapidity, if we consider their prodigious bulk, for many of them are vastly larger than our terrestrial continents; several, indeed, having been upwards of 50,000 miles across; and one of some notoriety mentioned by Dr. Wollaston, is said to have shattered into fragments almost under the observer's eye. M. Flammarion gives a lively account of another which slowly threw off a smaller or infant spot by a process similar to that of fissiparous generation: the parent left the little thing lagging in the rear, and sailed away composedly, whilst its offspring was agitated by internal movements and finally went down into the luminous sea around. The duration of some maculæ, however, is considerable. Follow one across the solar field, and after an interval of about 12¾ days (during which the sun performs a semi-revolution) *plus* the advance made by the earth in its orbit, the same object will reappear modified in shape, but as near as may be identical in position. For six months a big spot haunted the luminary in 1779, and in 1840, Schwabe tracked another, which returned not less than eight times.

But passing over sundry other features in their character, there is one circumstance connected with the spots which is extremely important. It could not fail to be remarked that there were seasons in which they were abundant, and seasons in which they were scarce. Certain years have passed without a single speck being discovered, or at least recorded. By and by the question was asked, whether there could be anything periodic in their proceedings? Continuous study of their habits eventually showed that there was a regular cycle, and Herr Schwabe ascertained that for about five years they increased in number, whilst for about five years more they gradually declined. Wolf, availing himself of still more extended observations, decided that this cycle occupied 11.11 years.

A still more surprising coincidence was detected. The intensity of the earth's magnetism, as expressed in the variations of the

Digitized by Google

magnetic needle, is subject to a periodic increase and diminution. Curious to say, this also is comprehended within a cycle of ten or eleven years; indeed, the two terms appear to be nearly, if not wholly coincident. But does this correspondence in action imply connection in cause? One circumstance seems to point to such a conclusion. It is that the periods of maxima and minima in the two cases are in exact accordance. It has been said, also, that "magnetic storms" occur with greater frequency about every ten years, and that at such seasons spots may be seen developing themselves in the sun, and changing their size and character with unusual rapidity, as if to show that the sympathy extended to the most temporary fluctuations.

Again, it was suspected by the elder Herschel that the heat received from the sun was greatest when the patches were most numerous; and, as some test of the accuracy of this surmise, he compared the price of wheat on our earth for a certain time previously with the state of affairs on the surface of the sun. Corn fell here (so he thought) as the spots rose there. Dr. Wolf also inferred from his observations that the driest and most prolific years on our planet coincided with those in which the sun's countenance had been most profusely speckled. Arago, Barratt, and Gautier, however, have arrived at a contrary conclusion.

But this is not all. Other periods of variation have also been inferred, if not determined. Wolf discovered a large cycle of 55 years, a smaller epoch of 233 days, and then a tiny term of 27 days, which virtually synchronizes with the sun's rotation on its axis. Another of 584 will presently be mentioned.

Assuming the fact of periodicity then to be established in reference to the spots, we have to seek for some cause which operates with regularly varying power. Nothing can be more uniform in their play than the tides upon our globe, but these heavings of the ocean are due to a force from without. Can it be that the blemishes on the sun are the results of some external instead of some domestic agency? Possibly the planets may be the disturbers of its peace? De la Rue, Stewart, and Loewy have elaborately investigated this question, and indicated a connection between the the nearer planets and the solar spots. Finding from certain data, that it was necessary to assume the existence of some travelling influence which returned to the same position with reference to the earth in the period of about twenty months, the mean being

Digitized by Google

584 days, Venus at once stood detected. That was her synodical time. Her bulk and proximity to the sun would of course give her considerable power over Phœbus. Jupiter is more distant, but his mass is very much larger, and he, too, meddles with the solar affairs, though, not apparently, in a predominant fashion. Naturally enough, too, it might be expected that Mercury, diminutive as he is, would claim his share of influence in virtue of his near relationship to the Head of the system. Accordingly it was found, that when Venus and Mercury were together in the heavens, there was evidence of a decided excess of action, as compared with the seasons when the two were estranged. It was also ascertained that, when Venus, and probably Jupiter, crossed the solar equator, the spots were drawn towards that region, but when the planet attained it its greatest (heliographical) latitude, their tendency was to spread out in a polar direction. Could these bodies act by intercepting the hail of meteors to which reference has been made, thus leaving blank or dark places where no fuel was supplied?

In a paper in the "American Philosophical Transactions," Dr. Kirkwood has recently discussed this doctrine of planetary influence, and finds it necessary to insert the following proviso, namely, that a particular part of the solar surface should be considered more sensitive to foreign force than others. Granting this condition, he thinks it unquestionable that the sun-spots are ruled in their behavior by the configurations of the nearer planets. To Mercury he ascribes the chief honor of managing the 11-year cycle; the 56-year period is due to the combined action of Mercury and the Earth, whilst the 233-days' epoch is in significant accordance with the conjunction of Venus and Jupiter.

"We do not, of course," say Messrs. De la Rue, Stewart, and Loewy, "imagine that we have as yet determined the nature of the influence exerted by these planets on the sun; but we would, nevertheless, refer to an opinion expressed by Professor Tait, 'that the properties of a body, especially those with respect to heat and light, may be influenced by the neighborhood of a large body.' Now an influence of this kind would naturally be most powerful upon a body such as the sun, which possesses a very high temperature, just as a poker thrust into a hot furnace will create a greater disturbance of the heat than if thrust into a chamber very little hotter than itself. In the next place, it is not to be inferred that the mechanical equivalent of the energy exhib

Digitized by Google

ited in sun-spots is derived from the influencing planet, any more than it is to be inferred that the energy of the cannon-ball is derived from the force with which the trigger is pulled.

"The molecular state of the sun, just as that of the cannon, or of fulminating powder, may be extremely sensitive to impressions from without; indeed, we have independent grounds for supposing that such is the case. We may infer from certain experiments, especially those of Cagniard de Latour, that at a very high temperature, and under a very great pressure, the latent heat of vaporization is very small, so that a comparatively small increment of heat will cause a considerable mass of liquid to assume the gaseous form and *vice versa*. We may thus very well suppose that an extremely small withdrawal of heat from the sun might cause a copious condensation, and this change of molecular state would, of course, by means of altered reflection, &c., alter to a considerable extent the distribution over the various particles of the sun's surface of an enormous quantity of heat, and great mechanical changes might very easily result."*

What, then do these spots indicate? According to some early theorists, they consist of smoke hovering in the sun's atmosphere, or of scum and scoriæ swimming at the surface of his ocean, like the refuse in a furnace of molten metal. In the opinion of others, great volcanoes lay concealed at the bottom of the shining sea, and these, ever and anon, cast up masses of "bituminous matter," which appeared to us as specks, but might be compared to temporary islands, like that of Santorin, except that they wasted more rapidly away; whilst others again imagine that the maculæ were projecting parts of the solar globe left dry and exposed by the retreat or withdrawal of the luminous substance for the time, in consequence of a species of tidal action.

Far more plausible, however, was the view propounded by Dr. Alexander Wilson, of Glasgow, about the year 1774. His idea was that the spots were "immense excavations in the body of the sun," some of them two, three, or four thousand miles in depth, and that the dark part was the floor of the hollow, whilst the shaded portion represented its sloping sides. This conclusion was deduced from the fact that when an emergent specimen presented itself on the border of the disc, the further side of the penumbra was the first to become visible, then the nucleus, and

* "Researches on Solar Physics." Second series, page 45.

Digitized by Google

afterward the nearer side of the penumbra. On retiring from view these phases were reversed. There could scarcely be but one explanation. A funnel let into a sphere revolving under similar circumstances would exhibit similar results; a cone or projecting body certainly would not. In the theory as revised by Sir W. Herschel, the penumbra was attributed to a cloudy stratum in the sun's envelope, which reflected the light of a luminous stratum above, while the solid body of the orb, shaded by clouds, reflected little or none. And in some shape or another this notion that the spots are temporary rents or pits in the solar atmosphere has proved the most popular hypothesis of all. Unfortunately for Wilson's views, he held that the nucleus of the orb, visible through the chasm, was dark and cool; whereas that searcher of suns, the spectroscope, seems to point to the conclusion that it must be a ball of intensely heated matter.

So recently, however, as the year 1866, Professor Challis, writing on the subject of the solar atmosphere, suggested that possibly the spots might, after all, be clouds of aqueous texture, in which case the coalescence of their globules would produce genuine raindrops. The obvious difficulty arising from the sun's elevated temperature was cleverly evaded, indeed utilized, by assuming that the excessive heat would raise the vapor in the form of steam, and that its particles would affect that well-known "spheroidal" state, in which attraction and repulsion are so critically adjusted; moreover, the existence of an ocean—a solar Atlantic—as the necessary source of this vapor was also deemed practicable, seeing that the enormous pressure of the atmosphere would keep the fluid from flying off unless heated far beyond our terrestrial boiling-point. But vapor so formed must, sooner or later, descend. It would do so in the shape of rain, and where a copious downfall occurred, there spots might be supposed to appear. Since, however, recent spectroscopic research, as Mr. Jansen shows, seems to negative the existence of aqueous matter in the solar envelope, it would be premature to assert that our luminary is a place for simmering seas and scalding showers.

On the other hand, Kirchhoff, who takes his stand on a nucleus heated white hot, intimates that a spot may be an agglomeration of gaseous matter—a chemical cloud—formed in the lower part of the atmosphere in consequence of some diminution of temperature in the underlying portions of the sun's surface. This cloud, inter-

Digitized by Google

cepting the flow of heat from beneath, would lead to the production of another, more shadowy in its structure, at a much higher point in the envelope; the latter constituting the penumbra, the former the core of the spot.

Dissatisfied with all previous solutions, M. Faye propounds another. The sun has no solid nucleus; it is gaseous to its center. Owing to the heat garnered up in the interior, the forces of affinity and cohesion cannot operate freely there, but at the surface it is probable they will come into liberal play. Hence condensation, and afterwards precipitation, will ensue. A series of ascending and descending currents will be produced, the object being to transfer heat from the central reservoir of caloric to the radiating regions above. Where the upward current prevails at the moment the luminous substance of the photosphere will be temporarily dispersed, and the observer looking down through the aperture thus produced will see the gaseous core, dark and opaque to all appearance, not because it is cold, but because, even if heated to incandescence, its radiating faculties are too slight to render it visible when contrasted with the resplendent material by which it is surrounded.

Now, to say nothing of the inadequacy of this theory on various grounds—failing as it does, for instance, to meet the exigencies of perspective, for the nucleus should be as visible near the border as the penumbra—it seems to blow hot and cold with the same breath; for it is difficult to conceive of a gaseous nucleus so highly heated that the photosphere is comparatively cool, and yet so dark that the latter is infinitely more brilliant.

With our limited knowledge, however, of the sun's constitution, it would be premature to speak with any confidence as to the cause of these interesting phenomena. Much must of course depend upon the final decision (if finality can ever be reached on such a point) as to the nature of the solar envelopes. In a globe so highly heated as the sun's nucleus is presumed to be, and surrounded as it probably is by an atmosphere of such extent and complexity, it is certain that great disturbances must continually arise. Whatever may be the mode in which the wonderful expenditure of radiant force is regularly balanced, the process must unquestionably involve much energetic action, and may be accompanied by many violent commotions. To a spectator, looking down upon our planet from a more elevated point than bal-

Digitized by Google

loon ever reached, a hurricane or tornado, produced by some slight alteration of temperature, or a thunder-storm floating in the lower regions of the air whenever the electrical equilibrium was broken, would appear a very frequent and inevitable exhibition. Even if the most commonplace breezes could be inked or colored, so as to become visible to such an observer, our atmosphere would seem to be the seat of incessant turmoil. But in an orb where gravity is twenty-eight times as powerful at the surface as it is here, where the pressure of the aerial ocean must be so prodigious, and where yet the temperature of the mass is so elevated, is it any wonder if that gaseous envelope should be the theatre of extensive local perturbations? Now, assuming the existence of an outer atmosphere encompassing the photosphere, and of a colder quality than the latter, Messrs. De la Rue, Stewart, and Loewy suggest that the spots may by produced by a descending current from the higher regions, which current breaking in upon the photosphere chills or disperses it, and by its absorbent powers drinks up the rays of light, and so presents the spectacle of a dark nucleus. It must be enough simply to indicate this most probable of all explanations, and the point in confirmation to the spiral shaped patches in which the luminous matter seems to be sucked in and carried down into a gaping vortex, these formations looking pretty much like cross sections of a whirlpool or water-spout, if viewed from above. Instances have occurred in which the penumbra appeared to be equally in rotation around the nucleus, and as the spots are evidently excavations or funnel shaped cavities, the most natural inference seems to be that they are due in the main to some descending force.

THE MISSIONARY SPIRIT.

Bro. Loos:—Your late article in the Harbinger, on Missionary Work, reveals a spirit tremblingly alive to the interests of the church, with a slight infusion of sadness for the past, and hopelessness for the future.

It is not in me to censure this lack of full confidence, since causes sufficient to produce it are not wanting in the past. The history of twenty years' attempt at missionary work, condemns the theory that individual church organization is all that is neces-

Digitized by Google

sary to general cooperation. What personal liberty gains by extreme independency is lost in efficiency in any general movement of this kind.

The oscillations of society from one extreme to another are seen in church government as in everything else. Our people seem to have reached their aphelion two years ago, but are now on their return to sounder views of church unity. They are beginning to see that if the whole church is one body, an organic union of some kind is fairly implied, coextensive with the body itself, otherwise it could not be a *body*. The Jewish people were *one*, and were so organized that Achan could be detected at once by casting lots for the tribe, then for the family, and then for the individual—just as we should be organized for cooperation by States, districts, and individuals. The fact, however, that we have never had anything of the kind, discovers, I think, a slight mistake in your remark that we have had about the same organization as some others that have wrought so successfully.

The A. C. M. Society never did embrace the tenth part of our churches. Our ministry were never bound to promote its objects. Their ministry *belong* either to synods, conferences, dioceses, or associations. In some of these their good standing depends upon their working up all the capabilities of their churches; and in others the force of habit in attending to the interests of associations through generations, gives them a great advantage over those who are only in their second generation as a people, with only twenty years' experience in missions. For want of organization our ministry belong only to their respective congregations; to no district, association, or anything else that would tend to secure their united efforts in any common enterprise. To say then that "we have had among us for years as good—indeed the the same organization as other people have", seems to me a very unstudied remark. I think it would be more correct to say that we have never had any organization as a people at all. Only one State—Ohio—has ever had anything like a thorough State organization, and this has been connected with no other State; nor have any two states ever braced each other in the work, much less all the States.

The last reports of the Baptists' missionary work in Ohio, show only about $11,000 raised—an amount that Bro. Sloan has equaled more than once in Ohio. I know not the number of

Digitized by Google

churches they have, but they publish the names of about 430 ministers in Ohio, which is more than double the number claimed by us. If they have double the number of members also, our liberality and missionary enterprise double theirs in that State. They no doubt sent some money out of the State, and we have done the same every year.

It is well known that a very large per centum of all missionary funds come from the large cities, especially in the east. It is also well-known that those cities contain very little of our strength either in numbers, or in wealth, and that we are dependent largely upon rural districts for our means. If a comparison were made between us and others after they were reduced in the cities to the little strength we have there, and to an equal number of country churches, the figures would be far more encouraging to us.

I presume that this is what makes us equal to a superior number of Baptists in Ohio, as they have there no strongholds, like New York and Philadelphia to draw from, any more than we have.—The really rich men in our ranks are very few. Our three or four hundred thousand, mostly country members, have not, perhaps, one third the money at command that an equal number of churches have whose chief monied strength is in the eastern cities.

Although the general Society's fnnds have generally ranged along between $10,000 and $18,000 yearly, this by no means represents what our people have done for missions, for the quasi State organizations, if all counted in, would increase it to $40,000, or $60,000 for some years past.

But I do not wish to blunt the edge of your remarks, so much as to supplement them by stating some additional facts intended to introduce a more formal statement of what I think the real difficulties in our way.

1. As a body we have had absolutely no organization at all.—States, districts, and counties have attempted it, but without any practical relation to each other to make us one. Until the present plan was proposed we had nothing of the kind before us. Organization without missionary spirit would be as worthless as a steam-engine without steam; but steam without an engine is equally useless. I think we have had much missionary spirit all along, but have had no general system rising from church to district, to State and general treasuries, to encourage or develop it. We have had no consecutive district, State, and general reports,

Digitized by Google

no district, State, and general secretaries, with the necessary mutual relations and dependencies. County cooperations unbraced by the whole body and a sense of oneness, can no more be supported, than would a railroad running from one side of the county to the other. A proper organization is what we need both to make effective what missionary spirit we have, and to generate more of it. The churches that give are the ones that have been reached and taught by the fragmentary organization we have had. The rest will never improve without the means of regularly teaching them by active district evangelists.

Efficient organization will generate the right spirit where it is not. Let our proposed organization be completed and every church and minister will gradually learn his place and will work to make their respective districts successful.

2. But the first thing to be done is, to get at least fifty per cent. of our churches set in order, and supplied with a ministry that will fit them to work for others, or even to sustain themselves.

If we have 350,000 or 400,000 members, it is unfair to count them all as workers, or more than half of them. Very many of them are like the churches in Crete, that will do but little in any way till Titus works awhile among them. My experience for years as Secretary for the missions, convinces me that we should expect no great amount of missionary money till we get our country churches in a working condition. This may require the most of our means for the next five years. This part of our work is fast rising to the first place of importance in the minds of our district and State evangelists who have canvassed the field. My own conviction has been that we must first of all return to the apostolic practice of systematically "caring for all the weak churches." This part of primitive Christianity we have not restored. They kept all their twenty-five evangelists named in the New Testament constantly among such churches, and refused to be "of good comfort" till they "knew their state." We do nothing of the kind. The strong churches monopolize the best talent; the rest are neglected and exposed to the raids of the meanest renegades.

The present plan for evangelization looks to a remedy of much of this, a thing of more consequence than the conquest of new fields. When we get our regiments in fighting order, we can

Digitized by Google

fight, provided we preserve an organization that will invite and systematize our liberality. Otherwise our regrets and complaints will all be in vain forever. Nothing animal, vegetable, or spiritual grows without organization; growth and organization are inseparable. We have been attempting impossibilities,—attempting large and well-sustained contributions without system. We may as well undeceive ourselves at once. If our units are so self-repellent that we cannot systematize, we can never do missionary work, and for one I would consider the prospect unworthy the sacrifice of another hour from home.

But I have undiminished confidence. Perseverance and a reasonable time will overcome all that is in our way. It will not be done completely in a year or two. No well laid plan rushes at once into large results. Our former failures have sprung less from the illiberality of the brethren than from the childish expectation that one man, a corresponding secretary, could manipulate 3,000 churches by writing letters to them, by seeing what few of them he could on the rail-roads, without the aid of a single State or district secretary, or system of any kind. This was about as sensible an undertaking as it would be for you to try to collect the taxes of West Virginia by writing letters to all taxpayers, visiting as many of them as you could, and exhorting through the daily papers to send on their taxes to Bethany, W. Va., Lock Box, 1966. The expectation was absurd and the churches were not to blame for not meeting it. Nobody else gets money in such a way for either civil or religious uses. A settled conviction of our previous folly demanded a pledge from the Convention of 1868 to sustain an effort at thorough organization before we could agree to undertake the present work. And it is sure to succeed if we patiently work on and give it time to grow from this new bearing. I hope you will not understand me as complaining of anything you have said, for they are faithful and earnest words, and burdened with a zeal for God that chafes against every obstacle to the triumphs of Christ. Still thunder on, all along the lines.—We need more of it. And if ten years of prayers, and tears, and labors are needed to put in motion this engine for good, let ten years be given; and if the present ministry can show themselves the men for the times by organizing and directing the energies of the thousands of churches thrown upon our hands by the labors

Digitized by Google

of the mighty dead, then shall we, like them, in honorable fatigue be gathered to our fathers and slumber grandly in our dreamless beds from all our toil. THOMAS MUNNELL.

"WIND OR SPIRIT."

DEAR BROTHER PENDLETON:—I must also "show my opinion." I am not going to attempt Greek criticism. You have probably had "quantum sufficit" of that.

It seems to me that there must be a common sense view of the passage in dispute. Brother F. W. Emmons' translation of the passage is the only one that conveys any *definite* idea to the common reader. Any other reading of the passage seems to me like the old Scotchman's definition of metaphysics. "When the *speaker* dinna ken what he says, and he that *hears* dinna ken, *that* is metaphysics."

But the *obscurity* arising from capriciously rendering the same word *spirit* in one verse, and *wind* in the next, is not the worst of the matter by a thousand miles. They make the Great Teacher utter that, which, as a matter of fact, is not true. In the first place, to make the Great Teacher say, "The wind bloweth where it listeth," is to affirm volition of the wind; whereas, to affirm that the wind had no more volition than the waters of the river that rolls majestically by me, as I write, would be to assert a commonplace truism. They obey the laws of matter—they obey the will of Him who "gathers the winds in His fists"—of Him who "makes the winds his messengers, and flaming fire his ministers."

Further, they make the Master to assert that Nicodemus could not tell "whence the wind came, and whither it went;" whereas, in fact, every man who has sense enough to tell when it rains, and when the sun shines, can also tell whence the wind comes and whither it goes. I therefore fall back upon brother Emmons' translation: "The Spirit breathes (or utters its voice) where it pleases, and thou hearest the report thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth, so—(by believing this report)—is every one begotten by the Spirit."

This at least has the advantage of being common sense and in keeping with the teaching of the Scriptures everywhere, and also that it does not contradict the facts of everyday experience. But

Digitized by Google

further still, it was almost universally received by the brethren for years. Brother Campbell not only accepted it for the later editions of his Testament, but contended earnestly for it, and said in my hearing that there was the same reason for reading "wind" in every instance in the connection as in the one instance.

Your brother in the hope of eternal life, M. T. CLAPP.

DETROIT, Mich., June 9th, 1870.

REMARKS.

Bro. Clapp comes late into the discussion of this passage, but he is none the less welcome to "show his opinion." If I could settle questions of criticism as easily as he does, it would relieve me of much study and often perplexity on obscure passages of the Holy Word. But I cannot. If, for instance, it could be established upon the mere authority of assertion as to what is common sense, that in no case can we metaphorically ascribe to a word, that which is not literally true of it, how many great and grave doctrines of theology would be at once subverted, and what a new world of light and revelation would be opened to us. When it is said "even the winds and the sea obey him," and we exclaim, "Behold a miracle"! the rationalist would only have to appeal to the new canon, and say—"Pah! there is no miracle in the case. Is it not contrary to common sense—absurd to affirm volition of the wind? *Obedience* is an act of volition. It could not be that the people meant *wind* and *sea*. It was something that had power of volition, and there was no miracle about it."—But impersonation is so common an element of all languages that I opine it will take something more than the *necessities* of this passage to banish it from legitimate criticism.

Again. We ought perhaps to defer to Bro. Clapp's superior knowledge of the wind so far as to concede that *he*, himself, may know whence it comes and whither it goes; but that every man who has sense enough to know when it rains or when the sun shines can tell the "whence and the whither" of the wind, we cannot so readily allow. We profess to know something of modern science—and whatever has been discovered in these eighteen centuries since the days of Nicodemus on the subject of meteorology, we are even professionally familiar with; yet we are compelled to admit that there is still a mystery as to the whence and

Digitized by Google

the whither of the wind. When Bro. Clapp is seated in calm meditation beside the "river that *rolls* (a metaphor) so majestically by him," and observing a gentle ripple creeping over its surface, traces in it the noiseless footsteps of a passing breeze, let me ask him, Can he tell whence it comes—or whither it goes? Suppose he answers, "From the west." Then we ask where is the west? Is it Omaha—the Rocky Mountains—the Pacific shore? or where? Is it not evident that no definite answer can be given to this question—even under the lights of modern science? It is only very *uncommon* sense that can tell the whence and the whither of the wind.

Brother Clapp falls back upon the translation of brother Emmons, and quotes it thus; "The Spirit breathes (or utters its voice) where it pleases, and thou hearest the report thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth, so (by believing this report) is every one begotten by the Spirit." We have to assume that brother Clapp quotes brother Emmons correctly, yet it is difficult to see how any one, even superficially acquainted with Greek, could put forth such a representation of the original as this, and call it a translation. It leaves out two most important words altogether and changes the whole grammatical construction of the last part of the verse. The substantive verb *esti* (ἐστί) is omitted, and so also is the pronoun *ho* (ὁ). Again, He translates *gegennemenos*, the perfect participle passive, as though it were the present indicative passive. This may be very good common sense, but there are not many teachers who would let it pass for a grammatical translation. It ought to be remembered, in this very confident appeal to common sense, that there is a great deal of common sense which the Savior did not find it necessary to speak to Nicodemus in this conversation, and, therefore, that the simple fact of a translation making *good common sense*, is no evidense that it is a *good translation*. If brother Clapp has not radically misquoted brother Emmons' translation, as we hope he has, then brother E. will do well to revise it, and stick a little closer to the original.

Besides this error in translation, there is a totally unwarranted interpolation (parenthetical) of a gloss, which forces the passage, in a way that can be excused by no recognized canon of interpretation whatever. "So (by believing this report)"! By what authority is the word "believing" brought into this place? Ought

Digitized by Google

we to take such liberties with the Word of God, merely to help out a *notion* which we take up as to what a passage *ought* to mean, in order to make common sense? If by believing "the report thereof" a man is born again, then let us adopt the doctrine that man is saved by faith alone.

As to the opinion of Father Campbell, we profess to know as much about this as any other man, and we know that he was by no means so decided in his judgment as brother Clapp supposes. It is true that he admitted the translation, "Spirit," into his later editions of the Family Testament, but in his debate with Dr. Rice, he quoted and commented upon this passage in the translation of the Common version, and expressed no doubt as to its correctness—and we happen to know from frequent conversations with him on the subject, that he did not feel warranted in taking any very decided ground on the question. So much for the point made by brother Clapp. But of course, neither the opinion of father Campbell nor that of the brotherhood can be regarded as settling the question of Greek criticism. W. K. P.

"OUR FATHER'S HOUSE."

This is the title of a beautiful volume of 560 pages, by the Rev. Daniel March, Author of "Night Scenes in the Bible." It is an attempt to read the revelation which God has made of himself in the forms and forces of the physical world and to trace the harmony of Faith and Philosophy—of the written and the unwritten word. It is not, however, a scientific, but a poetic treatment of the subject. The author uses the common knowledge, which almost all men have of nature, and reads, with the insight of piety and faith, the lessons which they ought to speak to all. The book is full of beautiful reflections upon the various forms in which the wisdom, power, and goodness of God are revealed to us in some of the more striking aspects and products of the physical universe. He is evidently a man of meditation, and of a deep, loving nature. He has communed much with Nature, and learned to see God in everything. From his chapter "Man Wonderfully Made," we quote a fine passage on man's susceptibility to Remorse:

"How fearful, how wonderful is that experience of the soul which we call remorse! In some moment of thoughtlessness, of

Digitized by Google

passion or of temptation, a man does wrong. He thus creates the sense of guilt in his own soul. He kindles a burning fire in the very centre and sanctuary of his own being. He cannot put out the flame. He cannot escape from it. He becomes his own judge. He pronounces sentence of condemnation upon himself. He is his own tormentor. He inflicts the stripes which torture him. He feels impelled by every sentiment of honor and of truth to be dissatisfied with himself. He suffers that kind of torture which is fearfully described as the never-dying worm and the unquenchable fire. There is no need of scourges or prisons to make the guilty man miserable. The fearful and wonderful constitution of his own nature is such that an accusing conscience can dry up every fountain of joy in the soul and make every blessing a curse. This awful susceptibility to remorse is a part of our unchangeable and immortal nature. Its imperious and inexorable demands must be satisfied in some way, or we can never be at peace. There is no province in God's universal kingdom where a man with a guilty conscience can be happy.

"And yet to balance this fearful exposure to self-inflicted misery is the equally wonderful susceptibility of the soul to be satisfied with doing right—to be happy in any condition with a good conscience. The deepest, purest, sweetest happiness, the peace which passeth all understanding, the joy that is unspeakable, comes from no outward state, it depends on no earthly condition. It springs from the simple, bare consciousness of rectitude in the soul. God has made every man the guardian of his own happiness by making him the keeper of his own conscience. Only be at peace with that clear, calm voice which whispers duty in the soul, and there is no power on earth that can make you miserable. Some of the happiest men that have ever lived have suffered every indignity and torture that could be heaped upon them, and yet they drew a pure, heavenly, divine peace and joy from the simple consciousness that they were doing their duty. This divine constitution of our nature puts it in the power of every man to make heaven on earth in his own heart.

"And then, what is most wonderful of all, when by sinning we have thrown the precious jewel of our own happiness into the bottomless pit of darkness and misery, the Divine Hand finds it and brings it back to us. By the great sacrifice of the cross we are delivered from the reproaches of a guilty conscience. God

Digitized by Google

himself plucks out the deep and dreadful sting from the penitent soul. He fills the believing heart with a peace which passeth all understanding. He opens before us the glory and the blessedness of an everlasting life. He adopts us as his own children, makes us heirs of his immeasurable riches, and gives us the ages of eternity in which to possess and enjoy our inheritance. This new, immortal hope, this full and everlasting admission into the glorious light and liberty of the children of God, may well lead every soul to exclaim, 'I will praise thee, O Lord, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made.'"

This is a good specimen of the style and spirit of this very delightful book. It is full of passages which glow with admiration and love, and in this day of dry and dull controversy on the conflicts of science and revelation, will be received as a refreshing offering of Christian faith and love. It ranges with free but reverent step through all the realms of the wondrous universe, and finds God in wisdom and love everywhere,—but not to dispense, as many have sought to do, with the necessity of Christianity.—After all the light that can be derived from these sources, there is still need of the revelation of Christ. In his closing chapter the author says,—

"Kind reader, it is not to put man's philosophy in the place of Christian faith that I have asked you to consider the heavens and listen to the voices of the teaching earth. It is rather to show you that our holy religion, the blessed Gospel of Jesus Christ, is so great and pure and divine that it throws light upon every branch of human knowledge, it gives dignity and consecration to every human pursuit, it harmonizes with all the laws and forces of being and life, it draws confirmations of its truth from every thing that is and everything that hath been or shall be. I have not forgotten that God's most complete and wonderful revelation of himself is in Christ. Having ranged at will through the vast galleries of earth, gazing with ineffable delight upon the pictured mountains, the purple clouds and the sapphire seas—having taken the mighty telescope and swept the infinite fields of space amid the blaze of millions of worlds—I behold a greater wonder; I am entranced with a more surpassing glory when I see the face of Him who was once nailed to the shameful cross, and who now wears the heavenly crown. In the height and depth of the love

Digitized by Google

of that almighty Savior I find something more difficult to estimate than the distance of the stars. In the mercies which he has shown to the lost race of man I find a number more difficult to count than the sands of the sea. In the humiliation which he bore for our sake I discover a greater mystery than the revolution of suns and systems of worlds.

"To know that Savior as the Son of God and the Son of Man is the most excellent knowledge. To sit at his feet like a little child and learn of him is the highest attainment of human wisdom. His wondrous work in redeeming the lost race of man shall be 'the science and the song of all eternity.' All power is his, in heaven and in earth. He holds the stars in his right hand. He has the kingdom and the crown of the universe at his command. We have only to walk with him in lowliness of mind and learn the lessons of love and trust which he is now teaching, and by and by he will lift up the everlastiug gates that open into the infinite realm of life and glory, and he will say to us, 'Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you before the foundation of the world.'

"In that great and blessed Hereafter, when the everlasting gates of the future have been lifted up, and we have entered into our Father's many-mansioned house, there will be time enough to explore its riches and rejoice in its beauty. We here see only in part. All the splendors of this world which we now inhabit are only faint beams of the glory yet to be revealed. The light that now reaches us comes from afar, and we see it darkly through clouds and tears. But if we stand ready to enter when the gates are thrown open and the voice of the King says, Come, we shall see the source of the glory whose faintest beams are enough to make this dark world bright. Good men sometimes long to live many years on the earth to see the advance of the kingdom of Christ—to rejoice in the coming of the day when the whole earth shall be full of light and love. They would willingly bear all the burdens and sufferings of this present state for years and ages, if they could only see the completion of the great work to which they have given their toils and their tears, their prayer and their hope. But there is no occasion for the fond desire. There is more to see and to enjoy by passing in when the door of our Father's house is thrown open than by standing without. With the use of faculties that never fail, and the flight of wings that

Digitized by Google

never tire, and the succession of ages that never end, at our command, and the great house of God's infinite kingdom to explore, we can never feel that we were called away from our earthly home too soon—we cannot fail to see and rejoice in a brighter glory than will ever shine on this earth."

These are the closing words of the volume. Its spirit, from first to last, is pure and loving, and we are sure no one can rise up from reading it, without nobler feelings of gratitude and praise.

W. K. P.

LECTURES OF W. T. HORNER.

EDITOR HARBINGER:—There are times when Christians of all denominations should forget denominational differences and unite against their common foe. It is this feeling that prompts me to write you a few lines with regard to a course of lectures on the "Evidences of Christianity," by W. T. Horner, A. M., of Buffalo, N. Y. I listened to these lectures first at Andover, Ohio, delivered in the presence of one thousand people, in a place where infidelity, in its modern guises, had been making sad havoc with the churches, and I immediately invited Mr. Horner to repeat them before my congregation at Jamestown, Pa. I am a Methodist preacher, and a member of the Erie Annual Conference.—By the laws of our itineracy I was then removed to the city of Erie. I invited Mr. Horner to repeat his lectures before my congregation here, and therefore I know whereof I affirm when I say that these lectures should be patronized by all denominations, to aid in resisting the tide of infidelity coming in upon us, especially from Germany. Strauss, Renan, Colenso, of Germany, France, England, have had the ear of the civilized world, and have by their subtle sophisms convinced thousands of the rising generations that Jesus is a myth; that the miraculous is an impossible chimera, and that "Moses and the prophets" were only the dupes of a warm eastern fancy. Theodore Parker has reiterated these infidel dogmas in America. Spiritualism, then, like a blighting sirocco swept over our land and left only blank infidelity behind it. Our public schools, the Sabbath, the legal oath, legal marriage, and indeed our civil liberty is threatened. Shall we become a

Digitized by Google

nation of infidels? Shall history repeat itself? Shall we re-enact the history of France?

Leaving these questions, which every true Christian will answer, I wish to refer to these lectures.

The first lecture, "The Bible and its Mysteries," is preparatory to the course. He first speaks of the Bible as a book of learning, politics, and religion; learning being subdivided into history, poetry, and philosophy. After following out these heads, he starts out with the bold proposition that if the Bible is the word of God it may contradict human reason. As the reason of the child does not agree with the mature judgment of the father, so the reason of man may disagree with the revelation of God. He demonstrated the insufficiency of human reason by reviewing the morals and the moral philosophy of ancient Greece and Rome. He referred to the two hundred and seventy-seven answers to the question, "Which is the greatest good?" and presented the startling contrast between the teaching of the best philosophers of antiquity, and the teachings of Jesus. Hence, any certain rule of religion must be purely a matter of revelation.

The second lecture is, "Objections Answered." The argument of Hume was first analyzed, when its fallacy was made transparent to the most unthinking. He proved Hume's logic to be false, even if the apostles had never told but one truth in their lives; that truth might have been, as far as Hume's argument is concerned, when they testified to the miracles and resurrection of Jesus. The most specious objections of modern infidels passed a searching review in the second lecture.

The third and fourth lectures comprehended the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures. After defining a miracle he said that Christianity was established by three classes of miracles. Frst, External events, as the raising of the dead; second, Prophetic enunciations, or supernatural intellectual power; third, Christianity itself, an effect for which some adequate cause must be assigned. He then reviewed the nature and bearing of these events, supposing that they did occur. Next he presented the evidence that they did occur. First, the existence of one thousand MSS., fifty of which are 1,000 years old, and some of which were written within 200 years of the apostle John. This space of 200 years he bridged over by the united testimony of apostates, infidels and Jews of the first and second centuries, all

Digitized by Google

of whom admit the miracles of Jesus, and testify to the existence of the MSS. of the Bible by their voluminous references to them. These references by the enemies of Jesus he presented. Next he referred to the testimony of the Apostolic Fathers, and their successors. He then presented the Latin Vulgate by Jerome, and the Syriac verson of the last of the first century.

The fifth lecture is an independent argument concerning the "Resurrection of Jesus," treated under the following heads: 1st, The circumstantial evidence. 2nd, The collateral testimony. 3rd, The facts. Under the latter head he presented eight elements in which he applied all possible legal tests to the resurrection of Jesus.

The sixth lecture was, "Prophecy." He presented the prophecies of the inspired writers concerning Babylon, Nineveh, Damascus, Tyre, the Jews and Jerusalem, concerning Christ and the seven churches of Asia, and pointed out their fulfillment as history has faithfully recorded it, often bringing to his aid the reluctant pens of Gibbon, Voltaire, and Volney.

The minds of the young are drinking in the poison of infidelity through the literature of these modern times, and this poison needs an antidote; the older Christian should be "able to give a reason for the faith that is in him," and hence the necessity of these lectures.

Mr. Horner is an able and forcible speaker, and the cause of our common Christianity has in him an able champion for the truth.

Truly yours, A. N. CRAFT.

JULY 25, 1870.

CIRCULAR.

TO THE DISCIPLES OF CHRIST IN WEST VIRGINIA, Greeting:

Dear Brethren:—The Savior says, "Disciple all nations, preach the Gospel to every creature." As all, even in this Christian land, have not yet been discipled to Christ, and as the Gospel has not yet reached all nations, there is much work for us all to do, both at home and abroad to effect the grand object which our blessed Redeemer had in view when he first sent out the Twelve to the nations. This work is now committed to us as stewards of God. Will we *all* do our duty in the case? Will *each* one do his *whole* duty before God and men in this noble work?

Digitized by Google

These are questions, dear brethren, for us each and all to answer before our own conscience, and the Author of both the conscience and the Bible. We will, however, all do well to remember that God is looking on, and registering our every act.

Your Executive Board, appointed by the State Meeting held in May last in the city of Wheeling, and to whom were referred many matters concerning the spread of the Gospel in our State, on the subject of finances recommend:

I. That in addition to what each church is doing at home for the preaching of the Gospel and the teaching of the Christian religion, something be given to "send the Gospel into the regions beyond."

II. That for the missionary work in the State, &c., each member of the church of Christ in the State be seen individually and requested to give *something* for this work.

III. That these sums be given regularly, and as far as practicable, weekly.

IV. That the church officers in each congregation, to avoid the expense of any agencies, act in this matter themselves, or appoint certain persons to whom they can with confidence and safety commit this work.

V. That the amount raised for this purpose be sent regularly once a quarter, the 1st of July, October, January, and April, to John E. Wilson, Wheeling, W. Va., the Treasurer of the Society.

You will see, dear brethren, that the Board does not say any thing about the amount that any one should give; this is left with him and the Lord. It is revealed, however, that the Lord loves a cheerful giver, that the liberal soul waxes fat, and that as the Lord has prospered a man so let him give.

Do not fail, my dear brother, to read this appeal for the spread of the Gospel, to the whole church of which you are a member, and urge such steps to be taken as will secure the greatest amount of good to the largest number; and to effect this it might be well for the officers of the congregation to hold a consultation about the matter, and agree upon a proper plan upon which to proceed in the case before it is read.

I shall try, as the State Evangelist, to be at all the Annual District Meetings; and I hope that the various congregations composing these will come up to these meetings prepared to send out

Digitized by Google

evangelists to labor with and for them in spreading the Gospel. We shall encourage this all over the State, and take pleasure in visiting the weak churches, setting in order the things that are wanting and encouraging them, and in visiting destitute regions in the State. A. E. MYERS, *Cor. Sec. of State Board.*

REV. XIX. 13.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—Several times through our press has appeared the statement that in Rev. xix. 13, Tischendorf's Greek Text has the participle from *ραντίζω*. I have seen the *seventh edition* of his text only. It has the perfect participle from *βάπτω*.

Now *if any*, please tell me *what edition* has *ραντίζω* as stated, and you will greatly oblige

Your brother in Christ, S. M. JEFFERSON.

REPLY.

It is a mistake to say that Tischendorf's Greek Text has the participle, (which in this passage is translated in the Common version by "dipped") a deriviative from *(ραντίζω) rantidzo.* He adopts, as brother Jefferson correctly says, *bebammenon (βεβαμμένον)* the perfect participle of *bapto (βάπτω).* We suppose the mistake has arisen from confounding "Tischendorf's Text," with the "Sinaitic Codex," which was discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 and 1859, at the convent of St. Catharine, on Mt. Sinai. This Codex is admitted to be among the oldest that have been discovered. Tischendorf himself ranks *it* as the oldest, the *Vatican* as the next oldest, and the Alexandrine, as the next. It is written in four columns to the page, and contains both the Old and New Testaments, the latter perfect, without the loss of a single leaf.

It is in this codex, which is at the least, as early as the 4th century, that the reading referred to occurs,. Instead of *bebammenon*, it reads *perirerammenon*, from *raino*, 'to sprinkle,' and *peri*, 'upon.' This reading has become especially interesting from an issue made between father Campbell and Dr. N. L. Rice, as to the source from which the Syriac, the Ethiopic, and the Vulgate translations were made. Mr. Campbell had said that no translator, ancient or modern, had ever rendered any of the family of *bapto* by "to sprinkle." Dr. Rice very triumphantly re-

Digitized by Google

plied, "the venerable Syriac, the old Ethiopic and the Vulgate did so translate it." To this Mr. Campbell responded, "There must have been a different reading." "Where is the evidence!" exclaimed Dr. Rice. "Is there any one copy of the New Testament found in all the searching for old manuscripts which presents a different reading? *There is not one.* Why then contend for a different reading? Simply because the claims of immersion demand it." So argued Dr. Rice. But now this great discovery of Tischendorf comes and the oldest known manuscript in the world, and the one from which most likely the Syriac, &c., were made, and just as Mr. Campbell conjectured, so it is. Was his conjecture made because the claims of immersion demanded it, or was it not rather because the laws of language made it philologically necessary? Mr. Campbell knew that the definiteness of language could not be so violated, as that a word so fixed in its meaning as "*bapto* and its family" could possibly be translated by *sprinkle*, by any one who understood the Greek, and hence his confident conjecture.

Dr. Richardson, in his admirable life of A. Campbell, has finely illustrated this application of law in language, by Mr. Campbell, by an analagous case in science, by Leverrier:

"This interesting fact," says he, "serves to show how consistent truth is ever with itself, and it illustrates also the principle so often acted on in scientific and legal investigations, that *by means of known facts unknown facts may be discovered.* From the fact that various readings of Scripture existed, that the word 'sprinkled' was used in the related passage of Isaiah, and especially because it would have been a singular anomaly if *bapto* could in any case be rendered *sprinkle*, it was truly inferred that in the original manuscript the word used, Rev. xix. 13, was not *bebammenon*, but one that really signified to sprinkle. In like manner, Leverrier, from certain disturbances in the movements of the planets, conjectured that there must exist, at a certain distance beyond the most distant planet known, another heavenly body of a certain magnitude, whose attractions could alone explain these perturbations; and this conclusion was no sooner reached than a German astronomer, directing his telescope to the quarter of the heavens indicated, found there the planet NEPTUNE, previously unknown, but precisely answering all the conditions of

Digitized by Google

the problem. It should be remarked also that, in all such cases, while the verification of the conjecture adds to the sum of human knowledge, it possesses also the reflex power of imparting an *absolute confirmation* to the *data* from which the fact had previously been deduced. Hence, while the result, in the case of Rev. xix. 13, exposes the falsity of the assumption upon which Mr. Rice insisted that sprinkle was one of the meanings of *bapto*, it also demonstrates the truth of the premises from which Mr. Campbell argued, showing that *in no case* can *bapto* or any of its derivatives be so rendered."

We doubt not, brother Jefferson, that the explanation which we have given above will explain the mistake which you have found going the rounds of the press—and put it right in your mind. W. K. P.

A HOMILY.

FROM MY NOTE-BOOK OF REFLECTIONS.

"Good Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" —MATT. xix. 16.

Christ, unlike all other teachers, knew the thoughts, intents and purposes of every one that heard him. He needed not the testimony of others to inform him of the character of any man. He, and he alone, of all who ever assumed to address men, knew what was in man. And why should not such an one, so highly gifted, speak as no man ever spoke. How transparent was the character that speaks in the text, to the view of this great Teacher. To most teachers of ordinary penetration of mind, the candor and sincerity of this young man would have been quite apparent, though doubtless the latter would have been overrated.—Evidently the young man himself had overestimated his appreciation of the thing sought after, as the result of the interview shows. But let us have the case fairly before us. It is given by three of the evangelists with some variation and addition; but all go to show his style and manner of address to have been respectful: but not enough so, it would appear from the sequel. The prophets were good teachers. And like them he called his attention to the commandments of the Law. He being a Jew and also a Ruler,

Digitized by Google

Christ cited the highest authority for an answer to the question, "What shall I do that I may have eternal life?"

At this stage of the interview it was all that Christ could say to the young man, who, as a Jew, had respect for the commandments of God. Christ thus honoring His Father's word, cited him to the highest authority. But the answer was not satisfactory; it was too general. And he asks, which of them. Jesus specifies, and the young man finding that he had kept them from his youth, yet still felt his lack of assurance of eternal life. He asks of Christ to supply the lack. It was lack of knowledge he elt.

Now here was the second stage of the interview. The highest authority was appealed to by Christ and admitted by the young man, but it failed to satisfy him upon a most vital question. The difficulty still remained as to how he should obtain eternal life.

It seems he had done much, but not enough to assure him that eternal life was his. Now if Christ should give him a commandment not found in the Law of God, he must assume a higher character than that of a mere prophet and teacher of God's law. Does not the question, what lack I yet, seem to admit a higher claim? But will the young man practically admit the higher claim? Christ indeed assumed nothing but what the question grants. If it does not, why ask it? Consistency demands that he shall believe and do the thing about to be enjoined. He hears, but does he do it?

Alas! for those who are wedded to the riches and pleasures of the world. The young man goes away sorrowful, for he was very rich. But let us look at the condition proposed by Christ. Go, sell all that you have and give to the poor, and you shall have treasure in heaven; then come and follow me. Had he done so, what a bargain he would have made! But this he could not consent to do. He indeed lacked the moral power to do it. He wanted confidence in the person who promised. His wealth was his confidence. He did not realize his poverty in a dying hour. He lacked the wisdom that provides for the future. Is this so with you, reader? A. W. C.

ERRATUM.—In Bro. Franklin's article on Sectarianism in the June No., page 353, seventh line from the bottom, for "system" read "schism."

Digitized by Google

THE HIGHER PANTHEISM.

BY ALFRED TENNYSON—WITH A SUPPLEMENT FROM CHRISTIAN THEISM,

BY GEORGE GREENWELL.

THE HIGHER PANTHEISM.

The sun, the moon, the stars, the seas, the hills and the plains—
Are not these, O soul, the vision of Him who reigns?
Is not the vision He? though He be not that which He seems?
Dreams are true while they last, and do we not live in dreams?
Earth, these solid stars, this weight of body and limb,
Are they not sign and symbol of thy division from Him?
Dark is the world to thee: thyself art the reason why;
For is He not all but thou, that hast power to feel 'I am I'?
Glory about thee, without thee; and thou fulfillest thy doom,
Making Him broken gleams, and a stifled splendor and gloom.
Speak to Him thou for He hears, and Spirit with spirit can meet—
Closer is He than breathing and nearer than hands and feet.
God is law say the wise; O Soul, and let us rejoice,
For if He thunder by law the thunder is yet his voice.
Law is God, say some: no God at all, says the fool;
For all we have power to see is a straight staff bent in a pool;
And the ear of man cannot hear, and the eye of man cannot see;
But if we could see and hear this Vision—were it not He?

SUPPLEMENT FROM CHRISTIAN THEISM.

The Vision is fair and grand, from the stars to the solemn sea;
From the cornfield's waving gold, to the silver upon the lea;
From mountains crowned with light, to rose-bush in the dene,—
No language may declare the glory of the Scene.
The thoughts of God shine forth in the robe and vail of light,
Which reveal eternal power, but hide the Person from sight;
But the Workman is not the *work*, nor is His work a *dream*,
Or man would be PHANTOM SEER among the things that *seem*.
The starry heavens without, and the moral law within,
Speak of One who has power, and One who will visit sin.
But had we no other light than that upon sea and shore,
Man who lies down to sleep, might pray to wake no more!
For iron law drives on,—and whether we sigh or moan,
Has never a word of pardon or mercy-seat by the throne!
The Sphinx has awful beauty! but her lips of stone are sealed;
And if she has a secret, it is never to us revealed!
Not from the morning star, or light of the regal sun,

Digitized by Google

Can mortal ever learn how his work on earth should be done.
No winds which rifle spice-fields, or tempests as they rave,
Proclaim the resurrection of dead men from the grave.
Cry not for light and strength in the field or forest dim,
Or where the sea uplifts her weird and fathomless hymn;
Not among rocks of *Eld* or lamps of the dome on high,
Can we learn the solemn lessons of how to live or to die.
The visible temple glooms, with funeral crape on the gates,
And the Priests are all silent, dead as heathen fates!
But there is One who speaks, with voice authentic and clear,
Of pardon and of life, and of love which conquereth fear!
Cleansed in his fount, regenerate by his Spirit,
Joyful we arise, and a kingdom we inherit.
The sons of the light, in the charm of the Perfect Love,
See the City of God which descendeth from above;
The streets of the golden, the river of deeper life
Can suffer no defilement, and see no human strife.
So we look to the Orient, where light and life were born,
For the supreme sunrise—the Resurrection Morn.

. . . . . .

From higher fields of light, where suns without number shine,
To the rocks of our underworld—the Vision how divine!
On olden azure sea the ships of the heavens advance,
The fleet of God sails on: (are we all in a solemn trance?)
No stormy darkness there, nor crash upon iron coast,
From yon vast argosies a vessel has never been lost.
In music and light they float, tempest and shipwreck unknown,
For the ether sea has rest, by law from the central throne!
But whence and whither they sail, no son of earth can declare.
Our emerald fields on earth are beautifully fair;
The stones of fire lie hid in the crypts of darkness old;
And man brings up to light rubies and dust of gold;
But richer the blowing rose, or cedar of Lebanon grand,
Born from mother earth without the labor of hand;
In the mystic force of life, which mortal may never know,
Whether we wake or sleep—the corn and the palm-tree grow!
Were it our portion *now* to recline in the summer woods,
Or dream on paradise slopes by melodious silver floods—
The school would not nurture men, as Lords of the higher Age,
When forces of sin and death have spent themselves in rage.
With iron soil, keen blast and spectres in the path,
With pestilence and fire, and terrible shapes of wrath,
We fight in Holy War to be crowned in the golden prime
With glory, honor and power, triumphal and sublime!

Digitized by Google

Surely, O Soul, there is One "in all, through all, above all,"
Whose voice we shall hear, when tempests have wasted their brawl;
Whose face we shall see, when the shadows have all fled away,
And the lamps are eclipsed in the light of His seven-fold day!
And if His outer court be rich, and his woven robe so fine,
HIMSELF from the Pavilion—how glorious, how divine!

. . . . . .

True there are wastes on earth of frost and devouring fire,
Deserts of burning sand and evil swamps of mire;
Tropical jungles rank, where dire malaria steams,
And life in death resembles the wildest opium dreams.
True there is ground so bad that the sunshine falleth in vain,
Useless the holy light, the dew, the descending rain,
And winds of ruin blow in glooms of wizard night,
Which bring from rotten marshes the pestilence and blight.
True there are forms of life revolting and obscene,
Fierce, hideous, and deformed, terrific or unclean;
Regions where ancient darkness maintains the anarch reign.
But how could it be otherwise when Nature travails in pain?
The forms of wrath are types—shadowy of human woe!
Prophetic of Man's ruin, since he with shattering blow
Smote his own throne and life with such a cruel thrust,
And put his golden crown and purple into the dust!
The man who turned away from his Lord in unholy pride
Could surely never dream that his Eden would abide!
For while he makes the rivers run red with human blood,
And pours forth defilement coarse as the wintry flood,
It is fitting that his wreck should crop out on every hand,
In fierce creatures of the sea, of the slime, and of the land.
But sure as God liveth, shall inviolate peace return,
And over created things the primal glory burn.
The darkness may increase, but we approach the radiant day,
When splendor from the Orient chases all the glooms away!
Not the horns of elfland heard in the Poet's trance,
Or the silver trumpets blown in his forest of romance;
But the harps of mighty angels, the sounding of their wings
Are over us and round us, as they sweep the trembling strings
Their Lord and ours—the Prince of life and love,
Is ready to descend from his pavilion above.
What voice is that we hear? "The winter is gone past,
The summer time of glory is surely come at last!
The turtle's voice is heard—the fountains are in play;
Arise my love, my fair one—arise and come away!"

Digitized by Google

[By request.]

BRO. REEVES ON THE CAUSE IN FAYETTE CO., ALA.

In view of the publication in the *Millennial Harbinger*, No. 8, for 1868, of a letter by C. S. Reeves, containing some alleged misstatements of facts, a meeting of brethren of different localities, from both Baptist and Christian churches, was held at Union church, Ala., on Saturday before the 3rd Lord's day in April, 1870, at which the whole matter was submitted to a committee of five, all members of the Church of Christ, who reported as follows:

"We, the committee, after duly considering the whole matter presented to us, for our consideration and report, beg leave to submit the following, viz:

"1. We think it due to Elder R. Adkins in particular, and to Union church in general, and also to the whole Christian brotherhood, to state that the publication in the M. H., referred to, when *facts* are referred to, is wanting of truth in the following specification, viz:

"2. 'To throw away to the bats and moles, all partyism and human creeds, as bonds of union and communion, among Christians, and unite IN FACT on the foundation of Prophets and Apostles.' But when corrected the proposition was to 'all present, who were willing to *pray* and *work* for a union to come forward and extend their hands.' The Union church, with Elder Adkins, are represented as having imbodied or 'joined' him. But the FACT is, Union church and Eld. Adkins *are Baptists* yet, and have never been other than Baptists.

"3. 'To *prove* their sincerity, in this glorious union movement, the Lord's table was spread, at Berea, at night, and there around one common table they met, and ate, and worshiped together.'

"In the above quotation the *whole church* is represented as communing with the Berea church!! The fact is, *but two* of Union members met with those of Berea.

"4. 'But could not see *how* it could be done, until you explained the difference between faith and opinion.'

"The above quotation represents the 'old brother' to say things which is wanting of truth; i. e., he did not say, *he could not understand how it could be effected until you explained the difference between faith and opinion!!*

"All of which is respectfully submitted.

J. RANDOLPH, J. HYDE, J. N. SMITH,
P. W. THORNTON, L. D. RANDOLPH, } Com."

Digitized by Google

CORRECTION.

BRO. PENDLETON:—In the May No. of the HARBINGER, page 292, is offered a short criticism on the meaning of John xxi. 15. I find in it several errors, one of which I would like to have corrected, as it makes me say what is not true. I state that all doubtless will admit that one of the following interpretations gives the true meaning:

1. "Peter, lovest thou me more than these other disciples love me?" or,

2. "Peter, lovest thou me more than thou lovest these things?"

In regard to these, after giving the rule for the comparative degree with and without the use of ἤ, *(than)*, I wrote: "If John had used ἤ, *(than)*, after the comparative, there would have been no ambiguity. In that case, if he had intended to express the thought in number 1, he would have written, 'Lovest thou me—πλειον η ουτοι, *pleion ee houtoi*—more than these disciples (love me)?' But if he had intended to express the thought in number 2, he would have written, 'Lovest thou me—πλειον η ταυτα, *pleion ee tauta*, —more than (thou lovest) these things?'" etc. The last two sentences were mingled by the printer in the article. By comparison any one can see the difference. J. C. K.

Good Words from Our Correspondents.

COLUMBIA, Mo., June 8, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—I returned home to-day from a visit of about two weeks to Platte county. I spoke several times in Platte City, and so did Bro. Proctor; one young man confessed and was immersed by Bro. T. P. Haley. I also spoke several times to attentive audiences in Weston, where there is a small band of faithful Christians, to whom Bro. Ja. Hughly preaches two Lord's days in each month. I spoke twice at Salem. Bro. O. C. Steele lives near, and has his membership with this church; he has long been their faithful preacher, and they are also blessed with one of the best Elders I have ever known, in the person of the devoted brother Jas. W. Steele.

The principal object of my visit to Platte was to attend the annual meeting of the corporators of the Female Orphan School of Mo., which was held at Camden Point on the 1st inst. The meeting was well attended—nearly all of the members being present. Great harmony and unanimity of feeling prevailed in our deliberations, and a zeal and interest worthy of this benevolent enterprise, which meets with such gen-

Digitized by Google

eral favor by our brethren. Much business was done of importance to the brotherhood and institution, and it was decided to commence the school next fall, so as to have the orphan girls enjoying its benefits, and let the brethren see its great value.

Bro. T. P. Haley is doing good service as a solicitor for an endowment, and if he only had more time to devote to the good cause, would soon raise an ample endowment. We are very desirous to procure the services of other efficient solicitors.

The sisters are coming up to this good work with an earnestness and liberality worthy of their generous hearts. They have already given $400 from the congregation in Columbia, and are still persevering in the good work. I trust the sisters in all other congregations will follow this noble example, and that every sister in the State will aid in this good work. We have been truly fortunate in obtaining this splendid property at Camden Point, which is so admirably suited for this school. There is a magnificent structure of brick, two stories high, fronting south and west, each 100 feet—standing on a beautiful eminence, in a campus of 8 or 10 acres, within 200 or 300 yards of a fine and newly built meeting-house, where there is one among the best congregations in the State, and in the heart of one of the most extensive and fertile and well-improved countries in the Union; and where population, for moral, personal and Christian worth, will compare favorably with any community known to me. I trust a bright and glorious future is before this benevolent move of our brethren. I am thankful to the Heavenly Father that I have been spared and permitted to participate in the inauguration of this institution, which, I hope, is destined to happify and bless the orphan in all future time.

But having detained you too long, I close, with my best wishes for your health, happiness and prosperity. With great affection, I am your *old* brother in the hope of Heaven, T. M. ALLEN.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., June 16, 1870.

BRO. PENDLETON:—Bro. Knowles Shaw has been preaching a little over a week in the Jefferson Street church in this city. The house is crowded every night. Twenty-four have been added to the church, sixteen by confession. Fine prospect for a glorious meeting.

J. C. KEITH.

SHINING PEARLS,

BY K. SHAW.

A Collection of Choice Music, Original and Selected, consisting of 52 Gems of Song, which shine forth with pure Gospel Truth, uncontaminated by any light or unhallowed associations.

Your attention is called to the following pieces, which will give some idea of the great value of this little book: Page 3, "Shining Ones;" p. 5, "Lambs of

Digitized by Google

the Upper Fold;" p. 10, "I Long to Cross Over;" p. 12, "Old, Old Story;" p 13, "Wait a Little Longer;" p. 18, "Tarry With Me;" p. 23, "My Beautiful Dream;" p. 15, "Jesus by the Sea;" p. 35, "Zion the Beautiful;" p. 36, "I Long to Cross Over;" p. 47, "I See the Angels Coming Now," &c. Shining Ones and Old, Old Story, are arranged for the Piano, price 35c. each. Every Sunday School should get this little book while fresh.

We are under obligations to Mr. W. H. Doane, Author of Silver Spray, &c., for his liberal and valuable contributions to this work. The book is gotten up in the best style, in paper covers. Price 15c. single, postpaid; $1.50 per doz., postpaid; $12.00 per 100, per express, at the expense of the purchaser.

Send all orders, accompanied by the cash, to

KNOWLES SHAW, Rushville, Indiana.

THE CHILDREN'S FRIEND,

A Sunday School Paper, in every respect what its name indicates, issued TWICE A MONTH, and devoted specially to the Welfare of the Children in Spiritual Things. KNOWLES SHAW, Editor, Rushville, Ind. F. A. CRUMP & Co., Publishers, No. 80 Fourth St., Louisville, Ky.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

Single copies one year in advance			. . . . .	60 cents
10 copies,	"	"	. . . . .	$4 50
25 "	"	"	. . . . .	10 00
50 "	"	"	. . . . .	17 50
100 "	"	"	. . . . .	30 00

The Friend is beautifully and appropriately illustrated, as well as printed in the best style of the art. Each number will contain a gem of music worth more than the cost of the paper.

The Editor's extensive acquaintance with the children and large experience in the Sunday School work will warrant the Publishers in promising our friends a paper in every respect worthy their patronage.

Nothing will be admitted to its columns but that which breathes a pure, sound Scriptural sentiment, uncontaminated by any unhallowed or sectarian influences. We are now supplying many Sunday Schools in Kentucky, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Minnesota, Virginia, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Tennessee, Arkansas, Texas, California, and many other states and the Canadas.

We earnestly desire your hearty co-operation in the circulation of the Friend. Will you not aid us all you can? We refer to the editors of all our papers—Review, Standard, Times, Harbinger, Pioneer, Record, Advocate, Monitor, &c. We are promised contributions from many of our most gifted preachers and Sunday School workers. We shall, by God's help, do all within our power to make the Friend an agreeable visitor in every household. We send it forth on its mission to the dear children, praying His blessing to rest upon it who called the little children unto him and blessed them while here on earth.

All communications for the Friend should be directed to the "CHILDREN'S FRIEND," Louisville, Ky.

KNOWLES SHAW.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2 50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding - , -	25	Extra Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edges - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. VA.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., AUGUST, 1870. [No. VIII.

BIBLE TRANSLATION AMONG FRENCH PROTESTANTS.

We are living in an age of free thought and action. The mere voice of *authority* has no longer the power over men that it once had. Men have long since been free to inquire and free to act. With all the inevitable license and licentiousnes this freedom bears with it, still it is a blessed and glorious freedom that cannot be too highly cherished and rejoiced in; it is a gift of God.

Men are, by virtue of this free thought, discovering their wants and their rights; they are seeking to discover what is true and what is not true. They are demanding to enjoy the truth and to be freed from the bondage of error. They insist that their great, legitimate rights shall be granted, and that the important wants of humanity shall be supplied. These imperious demands cannot now long be successfully resisted. Those in possession of old privileges against humanity,—the temporal and spiritual ruling powers,—are daily learning this lesson more thoroughly. They must put their house in order and prepare to give up every unlawful dominion over the souls and bodies of men. *The just and high demands of men, based on truth, must be granted.* Let all men understand this:—those who will blindly attempt to resist the onward course of truth and right, moving on now with such great power, will be borne down and swept away by the torrent.

Digitized by Google

There is no greater want and no more inalienable right of men than that of having the word of God given to them in their own languages, as correctly as possible reproduced from the originals; so, also, there is no more unwarranted assumption than for any class of men, Protestant or Catholic, to claim to have this divine treasure, in any respect, in their exclusive keeping, and to give it to men in a manner and form as may suit them best,—binding and loosing the Word of God, according to their own judgment and will. "The Word of God is not" thus "bound." Every man under the heavens has an equal right in it,—a full right to the whole of it. It belongs to the humblest man on earth, as much as to the Pope of Rome, to the Primate of England, or to any body of Catholic or Protestant scholars and divines on earth. None of these have any right to say to men, "We have this book in our charge; thus it is *ours;* and we shall dispense it to you as seems to us best." No! we deny that the Bible is thus *in trust* granted to any peculiar class; it is mine, it is yours, it is everybody's alike, free as the air and the sunlight of heaven.

It is the right and the duty of every man to demand that this Word of Life shall be given to him in his own tongue as free from error as possible, and it is the consequent duty of those to whom God has in his providence given the ability, so to give it to him.

And such is the demand of the intelligent Christian world now, and this demand can no longer be ignored and refused. The grounds of this demand are too strong, and now too well understood, to admit of being quietly put aside. It is well known that the text of the original tongues from which the early translations in the various modern languages were made, was imperfect, and that we have now a much more perfect one. This alone would be sufficient to demand a revision of the old versions. But furthermore, it is also known that our knowledge now of the original tongues,—the Hebrew and the Greek, especially the former,—is much more perfect than two or three centuries ago. And finally, it is a notorious fact now, acknowledged by all eminent scholars who have given any attention to the matter, that the present current versions are burdened, defaced and weakened by numerous errors, and often of such moment that they imperatively call for correction. The very weak reasons for delaying indefinitely the work of a correct version, are gradually losing their influence, ex-

Digitized by Google

cept with the over-cautious, the prejudiced, the ignorant, the fearful and unbelieving.

The demands for corrected versions of the Bible are being made with effect all over the Protestant world. It has become a great, living, irrepressible question in Germany, France, England, and America, and all these nations are moving forward in the work. In Europe the movement is not in the interest of any special sect or party; it is a question in which, with all freedom, the first scholars and theologians are making themselves heard. Protestant Germany and France are actively engaged in a very thorough examination of their popular versions, and in preparing the way for a general revision or re-translation. In America sect-life is so much more intense, that thought is much less free within the bounds of the evangelical religious parties, than it is in the great Protestant churches of the old world. The difference in this respect is very marked between the old world and the new. An American sectarian, who has always lived within the high walls and in the close atmosphere of our intense sect-life here, and has always been accustomed to the dragonism of sect-authority and sect-jealousy,—is utterly amazed when for the first time he looks over his native sect-walls and comes to see the freedom of thought and utterance within the old churches of Europe. He has been, all his life-long, rejoicing in the exclusive glories of Bunker Hill, Fourth-of-July, and liberty!—that he is utterly bewildered when he sees for the first time the wide freedom of thought and speech in the old churches of the "tyrant-ridden old world," where there is no Plymouth Rock, no Bunker Hill, no Fourth-of July; and he is shaken with fear in his puritanical religious collar and straight-jacket, at the thought of such freedom in religious matters. There scholars,—of the orthodox, evangelical stamp, too,—discuss questions on their own merits, as pure questions of truth, of science and of fact; here that is forbidden. Thus a translation, no matter how old and venerable, is critically examined and its errors freely shown, without reference to creed or sect-peculiarities. This would be almost unheard-of here. Such are the curious contradictions we often meet with in this strange world of ours! Freedom—a strange, cabalistic word this! how strangely and variously understood and used! Here in America is freedom, in religion as well as in the State; here freedom has its special temple and altar. Yes!—and so also no man is any-

Digitized by Google

where more free than in Rome——to believe and do everything that the Pope says!

The *Revue Chretienne*, of Paris, for June, brings us a notice of what the Protestant churches of France and Geneva are doing in translating anew the Bible, and gives a review of some of the first fruits of this work, in new translations of the prophet Isaiah.—We take the liberty of giving our readers the introduction of the article in the *Revue*:

"Our age is earnestly devoted to the profound studies of languages, and of comparative literatures. Never, as in our day, have languages, and especially those of the ancient peoples, been so thoroughly studied, and their literatures so philosophically treated. To the erudition of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is added, by the moderns, a critical spirit and a power of wonderful penetration; and by the profound study of the primitive elements of language, the horizon of linguistic knowledge has been extended far beyond the limits assigned by ancient science. Applied to the language of the Old Testament, this method of proceeding has enabled us to advance much farther in the understanding of Hebrew; and in furnishing us with new hermeneutical means, opens to us a new era in the science of Biblical interpretation. Up to the end of the fifteenth century, the Jews were almost the only ones that gave any serious attention to Hebrew. At this epoch the scientific apparatus, the lexicons and grammars, existed only in Hebrew and Arabic, and it was from the mouth of the teachers of the Synagogue, and at great expense, that a few learned men among Christians were enabled to make use of this tongue. In the first part of the sixteenth century the study of Hebrew was widely extended in Europe, and beginning with the Reformation period which coincided with this revival of the modern mind called the *renaissance*, the dialect of the Old Testament was placed in the rank of the classical tongues and studied with the same ardor, especially by Protestants, who up to our day have remained the masters in this branch of philology.

"In consequence of the part it assigned to the Bible in its religious system, the Reformation was led to study thoroughly the original languages of the Scriptures; but at the moment when it went to work at this task, the science of which it made use to procure versions from the original texts, was yet of but recent date; and besides this,—at least as far as the Hebrew was concerned,—

Digitized by Google

this science was but a borrowed thing from strangers, on whose testimony the scholars of that day were obliged to rest, without being yet able to judge of it and master it themselves. Furthermore,—what was known at this epoch of the ancient Orient, of its manners, genius, its literature? Philology, as a science, was yet to be born; linguistics was yet but the empirical study of languages, a study based on the traditional idea, handed down from the Fathers of the church, that the Hebrew was the primitive language of humanity,—*linguarum matrix*, and that all the other tongues had been derived from it.

"The situation of the new Hebraists at that time resembled much that of the small number of scholars in Europe, who at the beginning of our century devoted themselves to Sanscrit literature. For a long time the latter were obliged to yield a docile confidence to the Asiatic School of Calcutta, which itself wrote under the dictation of the Brahmins, on the good faith of whom it was obliged to rely while awaiting the moment when it would be able itself to master their knowledge.

"Protestant France occupied from the very beginning an important place in the scientific movement of the sixteenth century. In Hebrew, especially, it had no need of envying Germany, that has since become the classic ground of Hebrew science. The version of Luther, finished in 1534, preceded only by a year that of Olivetan, our first Protestant French translator, whose work, several times revised,—the last time by Ostervald,—has become the version most generally used in our churches.

"For a long time doubts have been raised as to the fidelity of this version, especially in the Old Testament part of it. These doubts ended in becoming positive affirmations, of a nature to compromise among us the authority of this portion of the Holy Scriptures. Hence the desire expressed by competent men of replacing this ancient and too defective translation by a new one, or at least of having it carefully revised and corrected. But as long as they addressed themselves to the Bible Societies, these wishes remained unanswered, and this could not be otherwise.—The Bible Societies have been in this last awakening of the church one of the fairest and most beneficent institutions of our Protestantism;—their committees, composed of the most respected men among us, have rendered invaluable service to the evangelical cause. But it is not from them that our churches must ex-

Digitized by Google

pect the accomplishment of a work so important as that of a new version, nor even of a satisfactory revision of the ancient versions. This work is not within their competence; they have received no charge or authority of this from our churches, which have committed to them no other mission than that of disseminating versions accepted by use.

"We await impatiently the moment when our churches will be able to give themselves a new translation, especially of the Old Testament, and we are following with the liveliest interest the labors of modern science, that every day brings us the materials proper to facilitate the task of those who will be regularly charged to prepare this work, the need of which is every day more and more felt. For, as to a revision of Martin and Ostervald, that is not to be thought of. As to the historic books, their text is far too defective for us to undertake to amend them by simple corrections; an entire new version must come in their place. This was well understood at Neuchatel, at Lausanne, and at Geneva,—and finally also at Paris. We possess already the complete text of Perret-Gentil—the three others are in course of publication. Before long we shall have before us four entirely new versions of the Old Testament.

"These incessant efforts of the church to obtain a good transtion of the Bible, testify both of the steadfastness of its faith in the Holy Scriptures, and its confidence in science, by the aid of which it hopes to succeed in daily better appropriating to itself their contents."

Such is a specimen of the free, liberal spirit in which French Protestants discuss the important questions of old and new translations of the Scriptures. What a contrast this to the narrow-minded way in which the American sects generally discuss this subject. Indeed we may say, they do not even, in any noteworthy manner, venture to *discuss* it at all. What freedom, what courage of faith, what confidence in Bible truth and science on the one side,—what unmanly, narrow sect-fear and sect-prejudice and slavish cowardice on the other! In the face of the now notorious facts of the defectiveness of the original texts from which the king's version was made, and the immense progress now made in that direction; and, finally, of the many evident and often not unimportant errors of it,—if you talk of a revision

Digitized by Google

of the common version, at once, among these *enlightened, free* Protestants, that look with compassion on the spiritual bondage of the Romanist, there is the most fearful alarm;—"distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth:—for the powers of heaven shall be shaken." With blanched faces and pale lips,—pale with fear and anger,—they cry out, "Not yet! not yet! Let errors numberless, let ancient wrongs, let darkness on the word of God abide, rather than have a moment's disturbance of our old, old, old quiet!" And yet this quiet will not be granted. The awakened spirit of man, thirsting for light and truth, and strong in its confidence in truth and in its own strength, and bold in the assertion of right, will go on in its work of dispelling darkness and righting wrongs and error,—let the weak, fearful victims of old prejudices groan and tremble as they may. God and free humanity, for the grand consummation of their work, cannot wait for such people.

C. L. L.

JEHU THE ZEALOT.

BY DR. GUTHRIE.

The curtain rises to show us the city of Ramoth Gilead, embosomed among mountains in the background; and on the stage a banquet, or probably a council of war, where Jehu sits surrounded by the most distinguished officers of the army of Israel. Suddenly, interrupting their potations or cogitations, one enters the chamber, whose shaggy raiment, appearance, and bold bearing bespeak him a prophet, or one belonging to the order. He comes from Elisha; and the Jews have a tradition that it was Jonah, who according to them, succeeded Gehazi in that prophet's service. Whether it was so or not, this messenger of heaven goes straight up, without ceremony or formal introduction, to Jehu, saying, I have an errand unto thee, O captain! And he out of respect for his holy office, a gallant soldier as yet who had shed no blood but in fair battle, and dreaded no evil, rises at once to grant what the other requested—a private interview, furnishing no illustration of the saying—

"Conscience makes cowards of us all."

Digitized by Google

They retire into an inner chamber. When they are alone, and he has seen that the door is shut, the stranger stooping down draws from underneath his shaggy garment, where he had concealed it, a horn of oil; and raising himself to his full stature, empties it on Jehu's head, saying, "Thus saith the Lord God of Israel, I have anointed thee king over the people of the Lord, even over Israel: and thou shalt smite the house of Ahab thy master, that I may avenge the blood of my servants the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of the Lord at the hand of Jezebel: for the whole house of Ahab shall perish: and I will cut off from Ahab every male, and him that is shut up and left in Israel: and I will make the house of Ahab like the house of Jereboam the son of Nebat, and like the house of Baasha the son of Ahijah; and the dogs shall eat Jezebel in the portion of Jezreel, and there shall be none to bury her."

Having delivered himself of a message that might well strike any man speechless with astonishment, ere the captain of the host has recovered sufficiently to detain or question him, he vanishes; like a conspirator against Jehu's life, who had sought a private interview to assassinate him, as Ehud did the king of Moab; or like one who has lighted the match that carries fire to the mine and ends in a terrific explosion, he opens the door and flies—agreeably to his master's instructions, disappearing as suddenly as he came. And the incident I have related was followed by an explosion that shook the whole land; hurled the king from his throne; and buried him, his bloody mother, her idolatrous priests, and every member of the royal family in a common grave, under the ruins of the house of Ahab.

With the bow bent to the breaking, their loyal and long-enduring patience exhausted, the people of Israel had probably got tired out with the cruelties and idolatries of the reigning family. It was now as with a ripe pear that drops to the touch: as with a mighty stone hanging on the brow of a hill, but so undermined by winter frosts and summer rains, that it needs but the push of a bold strong hand, and it leaves its bed to be shattered as it bounds from crag to crag, or be buried out of sigh in the dark depths of the lake below. Aware of this, Jehu saw the scepter within his reach; and how, stretching out his hand to seize it, not only with the sanction but at the call of heaven, his most ambitious dreams might be realized. With such bloody work, yet

Digitized by Google

brilliant prospects before him, his dreams—what in his more sober moments he had dismissed as dangerous, wild, and airy phantoms—about to be fulfilled, no wonder his countenance, as he followed the flying messenger to the door, bore marks of strong mental agitation. His fellows, who saw that he had received some strange and stirring news, ask, Is all well? With cunning equal to his courage, the astute soldier at first evades the question; assumes a modest air, as if of all that company he was the least ambitious. Pressed on all sides, even bluntly told that he was lying, he at length, but to appearance reluctantly, and only in concession to their importunity, comes out with it; and having won their good graces, makes confidants of his fellow-soldiers.

Now, as has happened in many other cases, the fable of Actæon is realized. Changed by the offended goddess into the form of a stag, the hunter is pursued and devoured by his own hounds—the throne of the house of Ahab is assailed and overturned by those who were sworn to support it—the army which his son, Joram, maintained to defend his crown and oppress his subjects, transfers its allegiance, with the facility of mercenaries, from him to Jehu. No sooner do the captains of the host see the sheen of the sacred oil on Jehu's locks, and get from his lips the story of the interview, than extemporizing a throne, and casting their garments—eastern symbol of homage—at his feet, rougher heralds than usually proclaim the successor to the throne, they fill the air with the blare of trumpets, and cry, Jehu is king! So sudden and sweeping, I may remark, are the revolutions to which military governments are exposed; especially when profanity rather than prayer reigns in camp, and the army, made up of the scum of the nation, is officered by ungodly and immoral men. A striking contrast to Cromwell's which was not less distinguished for its piety than for its fidelity to its leader, and the brilliant victories its arms achieved, such was Jehoram's army. Their impiety and profanity break out in the contempt with which they spoke of a servant of the living God. Wherefore, said they to Jehu, came this *mad fellow* to thee?—an ungodly, scoffing crew, they had no more respectful term for the holy man. Yet why should we wonder to find God's servants reckoned and denounced as *mad* by a world to which his own wisdom is foolishness?

Before glancing at the part—so bloody, conspicuous, and successful—which Jehu played in the successive tragedies of this

Digitized by Google

revolution, I may here take occasion to observe that the true pillars of a state and throne stand in the freedom, the piety and the affections of the people. Nations must be ruled somehow, either by love or fear, by the Bible or the bayonet; and ruled mainly by the former, under the influence to a large extent of moral and religious principle, what a contrast, in respect both of the security of the throne and the stability of its government, does our country present to that of France—gifted, as its people are, with uncommon genius, and inspired with the most ardent love of liberty! It is nigh two hundred years since this happy island exchanged one dynasty for another, and passed—rare circumstance—through a peaceful and bloodless revolution. How many in the course of a single life-time has France seen! She seems, indeed, to keep up like a boy's spinning-top by virtue of incessant revolutions; and destitute to a frightful extent as her people are of good morals and religion, how many more is she destined to suffer? We ourselves have lived to see her in the throes of five or six different political convulsions. The streets of her gay and lovely capital flashing with musketry, and running red with her citizens' blood, might have reminded the world of God's righteous judgment; and how, as has been well said, France lost so much good blood through the massacre of the Huguenots, that she has staggered and reeled ever since.

In the conduct of the revolution which God had committed to his hands, Jehu displayed as much wisdom as energy. His conduct was like his driving—"he drove furiously;" but the times demanded it. Dangerous in all cases when the crisis has come, hesitation or delay had been fatal in his. Having—by appearing to consult them—won the favor of his companions in arms, enlisted them in his cause, and so turned into partizans those who might otherwise have been rivals, his first step is to catch the bird in the nest. He must seize the king, where he lay in Jezreel. Should tidings of this revolution reach him, Joram takes the alarm and escapes; so, with a promptitude that deserved and was likely to secure success, Jehu hurries trusty men to the gates with this order: "Let none go forth nor escape out of the city to tell it in Israel." He will be his own messenger. The snake rattles before it strikes; but the lightning strikes before it thunders—whom it kills never hears the peal. And it was with the sud-

Digitized by Google

denness and surprise of a thunderbolt Jehu sought to launch himself on the head of Joram. So the cry is, To horse, to horse! all is haste and bustle; men are arming; women are weeping; hasty farewells are said; and the gate thrown open at his approach, out drives Jehu with his chosen men to lash his foaming horses along the road that lay, a day's march, between Jezreel and Ramoth Gilead. No stay; no delay; to the surprise and terror of the peasant plowing his father's fields, on sweeps that cloud of dust, where chariots and horsemen and battle brands are dimly and briefly seen. The Jordan at length is reached. A moment to slake the thirst of their panting steeds, and at the word in they plunge, to stem the flood, and from the other shore push on with new vigor to surprise and seize their prey. The cavalcade is at length descried from the watch-tower of Jezreel. One, and another, and another messenger from Joram hastens to meet and question Jehu; and to the question, Is it peace? get no other but this rough and ominous reply, "What hast thou to do with peace? Get thee behind me,"—fall to the rear, if you value your life!

Astonished, and their curiosity, if not their fears awakened, Joram and his ally, Ahaziah, king of Judah, throw themselves into their chariots to meet Jehu. He has been recognized by the keen eyes of the sentinel—"the driving," he tells the king, "is like the driving of Jehu the son of Nimshi, for he driveth furiously." They meet—place ominous of evil to Ahab's race—in the portion of Naboth the Jezreelite; him whose blood has been crying out for vengeance, How long, O Lord, how long! Now the prayer is to be answered; "the hour and the man are come."

Beyond replying, What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many? Jehu wastes no no time, nor words, upon the king. The answer has hardly left his lips when an arrow leaves his bow; and swiftly cleaving the air, directed by a surer hand than his, quivers in Joram's heart. He dies. The mother speedily follows, treading on the heels of her son. Ere another hour has come, this proud, painted, false, treacherous, implacable, bloody woman, flung from a window by her slaves in answer to Jehu's appeal, Who's on my side? who? is turned into dog's-meat—the dogs are crunching her bones on the streets of Jezreel. A princess, a king's daughter, a king's wife, a king's mother, what a fall was there! So let the persecutors of the righteous, and the iniquity of high places perish!

Digitized by Google

Jehu has still more bloody work to do; and in doing it—as when the lash is in hand and his chariot goes bounding on—"he driveth furiously." His eye does not pity, nor his hand spare, till he has emptied the last drop of the vial of heaven's vengeance on the house and seed of Ahab. Seventy sons of that weak and wicked king are living in Samaria; ready to fill the vacant throne, and, if they are wanted, supply kings to all the neighboring nations. These cubs as well as the bear must be slain; these saplings as well as the old tree cut down; nor drop of Ahab's blood be left in a living vein. With one stroke of his pen Jehu strikes off their heads. A letter, couched in bitter irony, and borne with speed to Samaria, challenges its rulers, adherents of the house of Ahab, to set up the best and bravest of the seventy, that he and Jehu may have a fair fight for the crown. The proposal fills these cowards with dismay. "Two kings stood not before him," they said, "how then shall we stand?" Honor, oaths, fidelity, are given to the wind. False to their God, these men, as may be expected of all false to him, betray their trust. False to their masters, they barter their lives to save their own; and seventy ghastly heads are found one morning piled up by the gate of Jezreel.

Not yet appeased, Naboth's blood, and that of the righteous whom Jezebel had slain, still cries on heaven for vengeance.—Another quarry has to be struck down. Two-and-forty brethren of Amaziah, king of Judah, whose blood was tainted with that of Ahab, are, unsuspecting of evil, on their way to pay a visit to their cousins—those whose heads are bleaching in the sun by the gate of Jezreel. The cousins meet, but not in this world. An opportune visit for Jehu, at one fell swoop he encloses the whole brood in his net; and while the famous character who is now to enter on the stage never wanted a man to stand before the Lord, and survived in his family to see thrones emptied, dynasties and kingdoms perish, Ahab has fulfilled his doom. His house is left unto him desolate; cut down root and branch. His sin—as, sooner or later, unless forgiven, all our sins shall do—has found him out; and in extinguishing his family a righteous God pays him back in the very coin by which, in destroying Naboth and all his children, he obtained unjust possession of the vineyard at Jezreel.

One great and yet bloodier work still waits Jehu's avenging arm. The priests and worshipers of Baal must be destroyed. For that

Digitized by Google

purpose, and for such a sacrifice as was never offered in the idol's temple, he has a stroke of policy—a *coup d'etat*—arranged, which only a man with cunning as profound as his daring was bold, would have conceived or ventured on. His is one of the greatest, boldest, bloodiest plots in history; and he is on his way to carry it into execution, and so finish the work God had given him to do, when he meets Jonadab, the son of Rechab. Astute enough to see that though he held a divine commission he must neglect the use of no means, and that none was more likely to promote his object than the countenance of Jonadab—a man distinguished alike for his patriotism and his piety, for the severity of his manners and the universal esteem of the people—Jehu invites him to a seat in his chariot; greeting this eminent Israelite, and original founder of all total abstinence societies, with these brave, pious words, Come, see my zeal for the Lord!

I would take occasion from this case to remark,—

1. That there is a zeal of selfishness, which, though it may appear to be, is not zeal for the Lord.

Is thine heart right? was the question with which Jehu accosted Jonadab; and if the question be understood in its highest and holiest sense, his subsequent history proves that he had most need to put it to himself. The contrast between the spirit of that question and the character of his future life is such as to painfully remind us of these words, Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege?

God frequently uses the wicked as his tools—when the rod has served his purpose breaking it, and casting it into the fire. His own people also have been called and constrained, I may say against their natural feelings, to be so. Instruments of his righteous vengeance, they have had to shed the blood of others when they would rather have shed their own; to afflict humanity when they would rather have poured wine and oil into its bleeding wounds; to appear men of strife when they were sighing for peace, and, wearied of turmoil, controversy and conflict, were saying, as they turned their eyes on the calm heavens above, Oh that I had the wings of a dove, that I might fly away and be at rest! But there is no evidence whatever of such a mind in Jehu.—There is no relenting; no recoil from his stern mission; no ex-

Digitized by Google

pression of pity. Apparently congenial to his nature, he found in his mission the means of gratifying his passions, and that personal ambition which, rather than zeal for the Lord, was, I fear, his animating, ruling principle. We would not deal unjustly, nor even very severely by him; but when he had reached the summit of his ambition, and, leaving a bloody footprint on every step, had climbed to the throne, where was the zeal he boasted of —his zeal for the Lord? It looks as if he had all along been consciously playing a part; and, finding no further use of it, had now dropped the mask. We are told that "he took no heed to walk in the law of the Lord God of Israel with all his heart, but departed not from the sins of Jeroboam, which made Israel to sin."

It may be that Jehu deceived himself. We are unwilling to regard him as a hypocrite: and it is certain that men—with a heart which the word of God pronounces to be deceitful above all things as well as desperately wicked—have sometimes deceived themselves, more than the most famous jugglers or impostors have deceived others. And what made it easier for Jehu to do so was this, that the reformation of the land and its religious interests did not conflict with, but rather ran in the same direction as his own passions and ambition. The public interests and his own personal objects were in perilous accord.

Such a position is a dangerous one for any man to be placed in. There is no doubt to what the ship owes her progress when her course is up the stream, or the waters of an opposing tide are foaming on her bows; her moving power is evidently a heavenly one—the wind that sings in her cordage, and fills her swelling sails. But the case may be otherwise. The tide, the current on whose bosom our bark is floating, may run in the very direction we wish to pursue; and as in such a case we may be deceived as to the power that moves us, so it is easy for us to persuade ourselves that we are moved by zeal for the Lord when, I may say, we are not blown on by heavenly but only borne on by earthly influences—such as regard for our character; such as the approbation of men; such as the pride of consistency; such as the gratification, perhaps, of what are more or less common to all, humane and charitable feelings.

Let a man examine himself, says an Apostle: and nothing stands more in need of being sifted, analyzed, and tested than

Digitized by Google

our zeal for the Lord. Have not men preached Christ for contention? Have not as large sacrifices been offered at the shrine of party as were ever laid on the altar of principle? Has not vanity often had fully as much to do as humanity with raising asylums for the orphan, the houseless, and the sick—men, in what the world regards as monuments of their generosity, seeking but to gratify their ambition—a monument to themselves more enduring and honorable than brass or marble? and have not men even burned at the stake, and died on the scaffold, and obtained a place for their names on the roll of martyrs, with no higher aim than that earthly glory which the soldier seeks in the deadly breach and at the cannon's fiery mouth? I do not say that any man's motives are altogether pure. Such an analysis as the Searcher of hearts could make would detect what was "of the earth earthy" in our noblest sacrifices and most holy services. Our wine is never without its water, nor our silver without its dross; nor we less entirely and absolutely dependent on the mercy of God and the merits of his Son than he who, when one spoke to him of his good works, replied, I take my good works and my bad works, and, casting them into one heap, fly from both to Christ—to fall at his feet, crying, Save me Lord, I perish.

Still when our zeal for our own ends and interests appears so like zeal for God; when the counterfeit bears so close a resemblance to good money that it needs a close eye to discern the difference and detect the cheat; when such as, in their natural honesty, would scorn to impose on others, or make a stalking horse of religion, may impose on themselves; it behooves us to see that God, and not self, is the center of our system; and that, in the words of the Apostle, whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, not seeking our own glory, we do all to the glory of God.

2. There is a zeal without knowledge that is not zeal for the Lord. "I bear them witness," says Paul speaking of his countrymen, "that they have a zeal, but not according to knowledge." Unless directed by that, zeal may be wasted, and worse than wasted. Baleful, as when it calls down fire from heaven, it may prove positively injurious to the cause of truth and righteousness.

And who can read the history of the church, or almost of any section of it, without feelings of sorrow and regret that so much zeal has been expended on the outworks, and less important parts, of religion? The water that might have been turned with advan-

Digitized by Google

tage on the green sward and grateful soil has been spent on barren and thankless sands; and like the lean kine of Pharaoh's dream which devoured the fat and were themselves none the fatter, how has zeal about ceremonies, forms of government, and modes of worship, without any advantage whatever to the interests of piety, outraged the gentle spirit of religion, and swallowed up the weightier matters of the law? Has the zeal been according to knowledge which, as if the outworks were more important than the citadel, gave more heed to matters of form than to those of faith?—that expending itself on the ornaments and walls of the temple, left the light in the lamp and the fire on the altar to expire. I cannot doubt that the prince of the powers of the air has had a hand in many of those storms about minor matters which have so often agitated, and, but for Christ's interposition, would have sunk his church. Speaking of Satan, the Apostle says, We are not ignorant of his devices; and with such device as military commanders employ when they make a feint attack on some outwork, that, while the defenders of a beleagured city fly to its protection, they may seize the citadel, Satan has raised many controversies about secondary matters—his object to kindle unholy passions, weaken the church by divisions, and divert men's attention from Christ and him crucified, from souls and them saved.

Controversies will arise that are not to be avoided; and it is also true that what the world regards as small matters may in the light of their consequences assume a character of the highest importance. Crowns have been lost and won on a narrow battle-field; a small hole in its hedge admitted the serpent into Eden; and solid rocks have been rent asunder by the tiny seed which wind, or bird of heaven, had dropped into their fissure. Yet when all the zeal, and money, and time, and prayers we can bestow are all too little for saving souls, it must be a melancholy spectacle to the angels of heaven, still more to him who gave his blood to save us, to see the life-boat's crew turn away from those who with outstretched hands are crying, Save us; we perish!—to waste the precious moments in angry debates on the mending of a spar, or the shape and form of a sail.

We may well believe that; and without breach of charity doub whether their zeal is not rather kindled of hell than of heaven, who are more zealous for the points on which they differ, than

Digitized by Google

or the principles on which they agree with other Christians. He at least presents a wretched specimen of religion who labors more to convert Christian men to his own sectarian views than men who are no Christians to Christ and saving faith. This is zeal for a sect, certainly not for the Lord.

Not only so, but the worst passions have animated and the most shocking crimes been committed by such as have said with Jehu, Come, see my zeal for the Lord! Paul persecuted the Christians; and exceedingly mad against them, haled men and women to prison, compelling them to blaspheme; and thought the while that he did God service. Many others have done the like. The Inquisition, with all its unutterable cruelty and bloody horrors, sprang from a religious zeal—of a kind. If zeal has bravely borne the fires of the stake, zeal also has kindled them—all the difference in some cases between the martyr whose memory we revere and his murderers whose names we load with infamy this, in the one case the zeal was, and in the other it was not according to knowledge. Excellent property as it is, when committed to such poor earthen vessels as we are, zeal is apt to turn acrid and sour. We have need, therefore, when most zealous for the Lord, or fancy ourselves to be so, to see what spirit we are of. Are the objects we aim at, and the means used to accomplish them, such as God approves? He will not be served with "strange fire;' and repudiating all uncharitableness, and bitterness, and intolerance, and persecution, Jesus Christ will have his followers support his cause and defend his crown by no other sword, and in no other spirit than his own. Intolerance, fierce uncharitable passions, the bitter tongue, pens dipped in gall, are not zeal for the Lord; but weapons, equally with Peter's sword, repudiated and forbidden by Him who, turning to that disciple said, Put up again thy sword into its place; they that take the sword shall perish with the sword.

3. Being on their guard against a spurious, let men cultivate a true zeal for the Lord.

Zeal is an essential as well as excellent characteristic of true religion. Dead bodies acquire the temperature of surrounding objects—not so living ones. Hence plants are less cold than the snow that wraps them, and the polar bear lies in her icy cave with blood as warm as our own. Wherever there is life, there is heat; nor is it till death ensues that the brow has the touch of

Digitized by Google

marble and the body becomes as cold as the grave it lies in, or the waves that are its floating sepulcher. So wherever there is Christian principle, a new and spiritual life, there is, and must be, zeal. There may be, and are, different degrees of it—just as the blood of some animals is warmer, and the lustre of some stars is brighter, and the perfume of some flowers is sweeter than that of others; but zeal for the Lord, more or less developed, will be found in all true Christians. Continued torpor is as incompatible with spiritual as with animal existence: and cold indifference to the cause of Christ, the glory of God, the good of souls, the honor and interests of the Redeemer's kingdom as great a moral as this is a physical impossibility—a man who does not breathe, or a sun that does not shine, or a fire that does not burn. Piety, as has been well remarked, may consist with error, but cannot with indifference—and if such be our state, our usual and permanent condition, in imagining ourselves Christians, it is certain that "we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."

Nor should we be contented with a zeal that smoulders rather than burns; and, giving forth more smoke than flame, goes off in speeches rather than actions, in good wishes rather than in good, brave, self-denying works. If I had as many lives in my body as I have hairs on my head, said a martyr as he stood on the reeking scaffold, I would give them all for Christ. Such is the zeal we should aim at, and pray for; and which, if our prayers spring from the heart, we do pray for in asking that the same mind may be in us that was in Jesus Christ. But how is that mind, any semblance of that mind, in him who calculates not how much but how little he can with some regard to decency give to the cause of Christ; for how small a composition of the debt he owes to Jesus conscience will grant him a discharge; how he can best excuse himself for avoiding sacrifices on Christ's behalf which would no more than a cobweb stop a man bent on making money, or winning fame, or gratifying his appetites? In such a case where is our love, and our likeness to Him who gave Himself for us, saying, as well he might, "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up"? There is no soldier whose bones lie bleaching on the battle-field, nor pale student whose life is wasting with the oil of his midnight lamp, nor even squalid wretch who walks our streets in poverty and rags, but may put most Christians to the blush. To say nothing of the world's, Satan has servants who scruple at no sacrifice, the

Digitized by Google

most precious and costly. I could produce thousands who have sold all, and parted with all—money, health, character, peace of mind, wife, children, everything man counts dear, to serve their master—but their master is not Christ, nor their zeal zeal for the Lord. It is sad to think that more is done, is suffered, is sacrificed for drink and the devil than for Jesus Christ. The Lord have mercy on us! May he pour out on us a larger measure of his own Spirit, and of Christ's!—that kindled of heaven, lighted at the altar fire, associated with the charity that thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, and hopeth all things, our zeal may be a flame that enlightening, warming, and blessing others, consumes none but ourselves.—*Sunday Magazine.*

BAPTIZO IN THE HELLENISTIC, OR NEW TESTAMENT DIALECT.

NO. III.

THE GREEK FATHERS.

The testimony furnished us by the Greek Fathers—that is, by the Greek Christian writers of the post-apostolic ages, is decisive of the question before us. These, of course, all wrote in the Greek of their day,—in the Hellenistic or common dialect,—*as their own language.*. Moreover, their Greek, both as to style and meaning of words, specially followed that of the Greek Scriptures,—the Septuagint and the original of the New Testament. There was no return of the Classic Greek, after the period of its decay, which preceded the New Testament, and least of all in the Christian Greek writers that followed the New Testament. The meaning of the word *baptize*, in the action it signifies, must, therefore, necessarily be the same in the language of these writers as in that of the Holy Scriptures. Whatever change, if any, this word had undergone in passing from the classic into the scriptural speech, remained with the Greek Christian church. Besides all this, these writers wrote on religious subjects, and used and discussed this term religiously; hence, if even it meant one thing in its religious and another in its secular use,—of which there is not even the shadow of proof,—we are certain that we have here its religious meaning.

Digitized by Google

We summon these witnesses in chronological order, beginning with those nearest the New Testament. The use of the word *baptizo* by these writers is so abundant that we can only cite the most characteristic passages in which it occurs.

Justin, the Philosopher and Martyr.—This illustrious Greek Christian writer and apologist, was born in Sychem, in Samaria, at the close of the apostolic period, about the beginning of the second century. He is the oldest church father of whom we have any literary remains of any note, and is also the first Christian apologist. In his *Dialogue with Trypho*, the Jew, he has the expression,—"— us baptized with most grievous sins which we have done,....our Christ has redeemed." Here *baptized* is clearly equal to *overwhelmed*; it cannot possibly mean either *sprinkled* or *poured*. "Baptized with sins," or "in sins," was a frequent metaphor of the ancients; and its sense is clear, as indicating *overwhelmed with sins*, as with a flood. So Plutarch speaks of "being baptized (overwhelmed) by worldly cares;" Achilles Latius, "baptized (overwhelmed) by a multitude of evils;" Chrysostom, "baptized (overwhelmed) with ten thousand cares;" and the same, "baptized (overwhelmed) with ten thousand sins," &c., &c. Compare Ps. 69, 2; 14, 15; 18: 16, 17; Job, 22: 11, &c., &c.

Clement, of Alexandria.—This eminent Christian writer, flourished during the latter part of the second, and the beginning of the third century. In his book, The Paedogogus, or Educator, he says: "For sleepy is every one who is not watchful for wisdom, but is baptized (plunged) by drunkenness into *(eis)* sleep." This is a frequent classical metaphorical use of *baptizo*. So Evenus, of Paros, "Bacchus baptizes (plunges) in sleep, neighbor of death." Heliodorus, "When midnight had plunged the city in sleep."—Again, Clement says: "More senseless than stones, is a man baptized (immersed) in ignorance."

Cyrill, of Jerusalem, born at the beginning of the fourth century. "For the Lord saith, 'Ye shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit not many days after this.' Not in part the grace, but all-sufficient the power. *For as he who sinks down in the waters and is baptized*, is surrounded on all sides by the waters, so also they were completely immersed by the Holy Spirit." We need not add a word here. Cyrill defines baptize so fully, that mistake is impossible.

Digitized by Google

Athanasius, of Alexandria.—Born also about the beginning of the fourth century, and famous in the history of the church. He has this passage: "In these benefits thou wast baptized, O newly enlightened; the initiation into the grace has become to thee an earnest of resurrection; thou hast the baptism as a surety of the abode in heaven. Thou didst imitate, in the sinking down, the burial of the Master; but thou didst rise again from thence, witnessing, before works, the works of the resurrection." The writer here also describes the act indicated by the word baptize.

Basil, the Greek.—This Greek church father was born about the year 330. He makes repeated use of the word baptize. Commenting on Rom. 6: 3, he says, "We were baptized, says he, that from this (act) we might learn this: that, just as wool baptized in a dye changes its color; or rather—using as a guide John the Baptist, when he prophesied about the Lord, 'He will baptize you in the Holy Spirit and in fire'—let us say this: that as steel, baptized (plunged) in the fire kindled by wind, becomes more easy to test whether it has in itself any fault, and is more ready for refining, ... so it follows and is necessary that he who is baptized in fire, ... should hate and abhor unrighteousness," &c.

Again:—"More pitiable than those who are tempest-tossed in the deep, *whom waves receiving one from another and overwhelming (baptizing)*, do not suffer to rise out of the surge; so also the souls are driven about *beneath the waves*, being overwhelmed (baptized) with wine."

Speaking directly of baptism, he says: "Imitating the burial of Christ by baptism; for the bodies of those baptized, are as it were *buried* in *the water*." Again, in the same connection, "The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb."

Gregory Nazianzenus, cotemporary of Basil, in a discourse, urging men not to defer baptism till they would have still more sins to be forgiven, using the symbol of a ship, says: "Neither let us burden ourselves with more than we are able to carry, that we may not be baptized (submerged), ship and men, and make shipwreck of the grace, losing all, because we hoped for more."—Here, as often in classic and Hellenistic writers, the sinking of a vessel in the waves is expressed by *baptize*. Nothing but total immersion is reconcilable with this use of the word,—sprinkling and pouring are utterly out of the question.

Digitized by Google

Chrysostom, the most eloquent preacher of the Greek fathers, has left behind, yet extant, many of his discourses, as well as other religious works. He was born about the middle of the fourth century. Our space allows us to give only a few of the numerous passages in which he uses this word.

In one of his discourses, the 19th, referrring to the common error, that the visible rest on the waters of the ocean, he says; "For things borne on the water, must not be arched, but must be hollowed (i. e., downward). And wherefore? Because on the water, the whole body of that which is hollow is baptized (immersed); but of that which is arched, the body is all above, and only the extremities rest upon (the waters)."

Speaking of David's clemency toward Saul, when he had him in his power, he says, "Sawest thou the nets of David stretched, and the prey intercepted therein, and the huntsman standing, and all exhorting to baptize (plunge) the sword into *(eis)* the enemy's breast." Chrysostom repeatedly applies the word in this way, as is also often done by other Greek writers, classical and Hellenistic. The plunging of the sword into the human body is here expressed by baptize;—how can a word that expresses this act possibly mean sprinkle or pour?

Of baptism itself he says, "For to be baptized, *and to sink under, then to emerge*, of a symbol of the descent into hades, and of the ascent from thence. Therefore Paul calls baptism the burial, saying, 'We are buried, therefore, with him by baptism into death.'" In another discourse he says, in like manner, of baptism: "Divine symbols are therein celebrated, burial and death, resurrection and life; and all these happen at the same time. For when we sink our heads under in water, as in a kind of tomb, the old man is buried, and sinking down beneath is all concealed at once; then, when we emerge, the new man comes up again."

So again, on the same topic, discoursing on Rom. 6: 5, "For as his (Christ's) body, buried in the earth, bore for fruit the salvation of the world, so also ours, in baptism, bore for fruit righteousness, &c.....Since, therefore, we indeed in water, but he indeed in the earth,—was buried."

Speaking of gluttony and drunkenness, he says, "For as a ship that has become filled with water is soon baptized (submerged), and gets deep under the waves, so also a man when he gives himself up to gluttony and drunkenness goes down the steep and

Digitized by Google

brings reason deep under the waves." Nothing could be clearer and fuller than the exact, specific meaning of baptize in all these cases. All possible doubt is here forced away. In the last case, to be baptized under or down, is to "get deep under the waves." Chrysostom also frequently speaks of being baptized, that is overwhelmed, with cares, sins, afflictions, &c., just like David, when he speaks of "the billows" that "had gone over him."

John, of Damascus, born about the end of the seventh century, discoursing on Baptism, says: "Israel, if he had not passed through the sea, would not have been delivered from Pharoah; and you, if you do not pass through the water, will not be delivered from the bitter tyranny of the devil."

Theophylact,—about 1070,—in giving the views of the old Greek interpreters, makes very abundant reference to baptism. Commenting on Acts 1: 5, 'You shall be baptized in the Holy Spirit,' he speaks thus: "The word 'be baptized,' signifies the *abundance*, and as it were *the riches*, of the participation of the Holy Spirit; as also, in what the senses perceive, he who is baptized in water has, drenching the whole body, while he who simply receives water is not wholly wetted in all places."

Here is a Greek writer, Archbishop of Achridia, of the eleventh century, giving, in this description of baptism, precisely the distinctive difference between *baptize* and sprinkling or pouring. To baptize, he says, is to wet or "drench the body all over," showing thus the "abundance," and "riches of the participation" in the baptism of the Holy Spirit; whereas to "receive" would be less, as "he who *simply receives* water," as in sprinkling or pouring, is not wetted all over,—and hence would not be a *baptism*. Thus we have here in the most direct form the decision of the question before us,—as to what the Greek Christians understood precisely by the act of baptizing. Nothing could be clearer.

On the same expression, to "baptize in the Holy Spirit," Mat. 3: 11, he says, "That is, he will *deluge you* abundantly, αφθορως, with the graces of the Holy Spirit." In all his references to baptism Theophylact speaks with the same clearness as to the act of baptizing—that it is a total submersion of the whole body in water.

We have now accomplished our proposed task, which was, to show the meaning of baptizo in the Hellenistic Greek. We have reached this end in the most satisfactory way, by citing cases in

Digitized by Google

which this word occurs in the Hellenistic writers,—giving us thus the actual use of the word in the Hellenistic speech. The authorities,—the testimonies adduced, begin with the very beginning of this dialect, three centuries before Christ, and continue to a thousand years after Christ, covering thus its whole history. We have quoted the Greek versions, the Jewish writers, and the Christian Fathers, the most direct and authoritative representatives of the Hellenistic dialect, for the purpose before us;—if any writers understood the use of *baptizo*, as used in Jewish and Christian Scriptures, it is the writers we have quoted.

And now, we submit to the candid reader, what possibre conclusion can be drawn from the evidence given? One only,—and that is, that baptizo, among the Hellenist Jews and Christians, before, contemporary with, and after Christ, meant, as to the physical act, to immerse or submerge; that there is no shadow of proof that it was ever otherwise understood; that the sense of pouring and sprinkling is evidently out of the question; and that therefore, separate from its peculiar religious import, it signifies in Hellenistic precisely the same as in classic Greek.

The Hellenistic speech has remained from the days of the decay of the classic Greek, the ruling form down the ages; the classic has never returned. Whatever, therefore, this word signified in the early ages of our era, it has continued to signify, in respect to the act it expresses. The Greek has continued to be spoken and written to our day. We close, then, with the words of a modern Greek scholar, to show how the Greeks understand, to this day, the word baptizo. We quote from a French work of Alexander de Stourdza, entitled *Considerations on the doctrine and spirit of the Orthodox Church*, Stuttgard, 1816. De Stourdza has written several works on the Greek Church, and was at one time Councillor at the Russian Court. He says:

"The distinctive character of the institution of baptism, is *immersion*, baptisma, which cannot be omitted without destroying the mystic sense of the sacrament, and without contradicting at the same time the etymological signification of the word, which serves to designate it.

"The occidental church, therefore, has strayed away from the imitation of Jesus Christ; she has made to disappear all the sublimity of the exterior sign. She also is guilty of an abuse of words and ideas in practising *baptism* by *aspersion*, the very enun-

Digitized by Google

ciation of which is in itself *a laughable contradiction.* In reality, the word *baptizo—immergo*—has but a single meaning. It signifies literally and always, to *plunge*, (il signifie literalment et perpetuellement *plonger*). Baptism and immersion, therefore, are identical; and to say, "*baptism* by *aspersion*," is as if one would say, "*immersion* by aspersion," or any other contradiction of the same nature.

"Who, after seeing this, could refuse his assent, or hesitate to rènder homage, to the wise fidelity of our church, unchangeably attached to the doctrinal and ceremonial tradition of primitive Christianity? She alone has preserved the deep meaning as well as the imposing forms of the initiatory sacrament; and one need only read in the annals of the first century a description of the baptismal ceremonies through which the catechumens had to pass, to be struck with their perfect identity with our present rites.

"At the present moment, nearly six millions of Christians yet administer baptism after the similitude of that of Jesus Christ and of the apostles, and according to the institutions of the primitive church."

In view of the testimonies we have cited, we may well say with an eminent living scholar and divine of the Church of England, Dr. Stanley:

"There can be no question that the original mode of baptism —the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost monstrous case. To this form the Eastern Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid."* C. L. L.

Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are pure, whatsover things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report: if there be any virtue, and if there be any praise, think on these things.—PAUL.

---

* ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, Canon of Christ's Church, and now Dean of Westminster.—*Lectures* on the History of the Eastern Church, p. 117.

Digitized by Google

From the British Quarterly Review.

THE PLACE WHERE LIGHT DWELLETH.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 393.)

But besides the maculæ, the sun's surface sometimes exhibits shining spots known as faculæ. They are more brilliant even than the surrounding luminous matter. That there is some association between these and the black specks is undeniable: frequently they appear on the outer border of the penumbra, and occasionally they take the form of resplendent ridges or ravines converging toward a central gulf. When the ordinary dark spots vanish they are often succeeded by bright ones, and when the faculæ present themselves alone, this circumstance probably indicates that they will shortly be followed by the appearance of some of the black brotherhood on the same site.

There are other curious features also on the sun's countenance. Far from possessing a smooth uniform surface, variegated only with a few beauty-spots, like the ladies of a past generation, his visage is mottled all over in such a way that it has been compared to the dotting or graining of an engraving. "It looks," says Father Secchi, "like a tissue strewn with white points more or less elongated in form, and separated by a net-work, at the crossings of which little black holes appear." In the penumbra, these white bodies seem to arrange themselves in lines like filaments converging toward the nucleus, as if striving to shoot across the dark abyss, and then interlacing with each other, as if eager to fill up some gash, or coat over some wound in the photosphere. These peculiar appearances have been compared to rice-grains by Mr. Stone, to chipped blades of straw by Mr. Dawes, and to willow leaves by Mr. Nasmyth. The latter gentleman even hinted that they might consist of solid bodies; and Sir W. Armstrong, in his address to the British Association at Newcastle (1863), observed: "The forms are so regular in size and shape, as to have led to a suggestion from one of our profoundest philosophers of their being organisms, possibly even partaking of the nature of life, but at all events closely connected with the heating and vivifying influences of the sun." Upon the strength of this statement, it was forthwith announced by some imaginative individuals that living beings had been descried in the orb, floating like

Digitized by Google

leviathans in a luminous sea, and measuring a thousand miles in length by a hundred in breadth! Most probably, the peculiarities in question are due in a great measure to the same causes which lead to the production of the spots.

On all these points, however, much uncertainty must exist, for want of a clear knowledge of the sun's atmosphere. Sir William Herschel assumed the existence of two envelopes only; the lower consisting of gaseous matter in a non-luminous state; the upper composed of gaseous matter also, but in a flaming or resplendent condition. It is from this superior layer we derive our light and heat; the other was supposed to shield the surface of the sun from the scorching rays of the photosphere. But a third investing ocean at least must also be admitted. The corona which encompasses the body of the orb during total eclipses, like the glory round the head of old saints, shows that there is an exterior envelope mounted upon the photosphere. Mr. Norman Lockyer also concluded, from his spectroscopic researches, that the "red protuberances" were due to the heaping up of hydrogen gas, which formed a continuous layer round the sun.

Amongst other interesting questions which have been propounded respecting the sun, it has been asked whether this body does not act as a huge magnet, and produce, in that capacity, all the various magnetic phenomena which are manifest upon our earth?

That the "king of day" plays the part of a great loadstone, and keeps all the planets in charmed objection to his authority, is of course a very poetical version of things, and many a fanciful mind has conjured up a vision of an orrery moved, or at least maintained, entirely by magnetism. But without displacing the power or principle, whichever it may be, which we call attraction, does the sun, by his direct action, excite those magnetic currents which are perpetually streaming over our planet, or stir up those magnetic storms which sometimes break out suddenly and rage over whole continents, though insensible to our human organs except so far as they are disclosed by the convulsive quiverings of the needle?

This point has been carefully investigated, and the conclusion drawn that such terrestrial disturbances are not caused by variations in the magnetism of the sun. The mode in which that body affects the magnetic condition of the earth, says Mr. G. Cham-

Digitized by Google

bers, "is not analogous to the action of a magnet upon a mass of soft iron placed at a great distance from it," but the influences proceeding from the great luminary do so in a "form different from that of magnetic force, and are converted into the latter form of force probably by their action upon the matter of the earth or its atmosphere." And this conclusion is confirmed by Professor W. Thomson, who says that no effect of the sun's action as a magnet is sensible at the earth.*

Upon another point connected with the central orb a very valuable result may be noted. Until recently, if we had asked any school girl what was the distance of the earth from the sun, she would have answered, with the confidence of an itinerant lecturer on the universe, and with the promptitude of a flash of lightning, "95,000,000 of miles." This, in her case, would have been one of the principal fruits of the charge of so many guineas per annum for the use of the globes. If the same question had been propounded to a philosopher, he would have returned the same reply, with a hint as to some odd fractional miles, but with a caution that the calculation was only provisional, and must be taken, like a merchant's account, with a clause of "errors excepted."—Putting the matter in professional language, he would have intimated that the sun's parallax, (or the angle subtended by the earth's radius when seen from the sun,) was set down as something more than eight seconds and a half (8″.57), but that there were grounds for supposing that it really amounted to nearly nine seconds (8″.95). The difference between these two estimates would bring our globe between three and four millions of miles nearer to the Giver of light. Now, the peculiarity of the case is, that astronomers have arrived at this amended result by separate routes, and for the most part without any definite expectation of correcting the error in question. When experimenting, for instance, upon the velocity of light, Foucault found that its accredited speed must be lowered, and this rendered it necessary to reduce the distance of the sun by the amount just mentioned. In studying the moon's motion, Hanssen showed that the disturbing

* "Philosophical Transactions," vol. cliii. p. 503, Mr. G. Chambers on "The Nature of the Sun's Magnetic Action upon the Earth." The reader will doubtless perceive that the question here raised is not as to the influence which the orb exerts upon our magnetism by means of its heat or otherwise, but whether it operates as a great loadstone simply.

Digitized by Google

influence of the sun upon our satellite must be revised to an extent which would involve an alteration to nearly the same amount. The planet Mars has been called upon to furnish further evidence, and Venus, on whose testimony philosophers long relied, has again been put into the witness-box, and agrees with the other deponents almost to the letter. It was, in fact, upon her deposition, taken on the occurrence of the celebrated transit of 1769, when commissioners were sent to examine her in the southern hemisphere, that the standard valuation of the sun's distance was based; and when Mr. Stone went over the calculations, the rectified result indicated a parallax of 8″.9, instead of the old one of 8″.57. From this striking coincidence, it may be safely assumed that the distance of the sun from the earth is little more than ninety-one millions of miles (91,300,000, in reality); and when we consider how much astronomical science depends upon the accuracy of its data, it will be admitted that the elucidation of this point by methods so thoroughly independent, is a curious as well as a creditable feature in the doings of the age.

But whilst the relative distance of the two globes is preserved, it must not be forgotten that the sun is ever in progressive motion through the heavens, as if he were bent upon some errand of life or death. That he—lord, as he is, of the system—should be subject to the same law of axial rotation as his satellites, may excite no surprise; but that he should be posting headlong through space encircled by a troup of worlds, some with their worldlings around them, and all engaged in performing their mazy evolutions, is a conception which the mind cannot readily realize. Still more, if all the orbs which we have been accustomed to regard as "fixed in their everlasting seats," should partake of the same erratic habits, can we repress the thought that, wide as the celestial plains may be, and spacious as they may appear for purposes of parade merely, yet, sooner or later, fearful collisions must ensue, if the whole starry host is perpetually on the wing? Now, theoretically, a movement of translation in space may be inferred from the fact that the sun possesses a movement of rotation. Practically, the question has been put upon a footing of reasonable certainty by Sir W. Herschel, Argelander, Struve, Madler, and others. Broadly stated, the principle upon which the inquiry was based by the first of these philosophers, is familiar to every town pedestrian in the lamps in the streets, and to every

Digitized by Google

country traveler in the trees of the avenue, or the telegraph posts on a railway. These objects, as we approach them, appear to recede from each other—as we retire, to run together into a cluster. Upon the supposition of the sun's motion there must, therefore, be some quarter in the heavens where the stars will seem to be opening out their ranks, and to this we must consequently be speeding; whilst in the opposite region the reverse effect will appear; for there the bright ones will seem to be closing up their array. Such a region was found. Out of fifty-six stars examined by Sir W. Herschel, forty-four showed an apparent proper motion, which could only be explained on the assumption that the sun was journeying toward a given point (γ) in the constellation Hercules. Subsequent researches have placed the fact of a translatory movement beyond dispute. This splendid gallop is conducted at the rate of nearly five miles per second, or 18,000 per hour!

But to what end? This question involves another. Is the orb traveling in a straight line, or in a curve of prodigious sweep? Is his motion the result of some primitive impulse, or of the combined attraction of the celestial bodies, or of a resistless summons from some distant master-masses; or is the entire host of heaven in ceaseless circuit around some mysterious center of gravity? For it is an obvious inference that if our sun is thus in movement, the other stars may be nomadic as well. Indeed, the spectroscopic determination of the flight of Sirius by Mr. Huggins affords positive demonstration on this point. But to say whether the path of the sun is rectilineal or orbital surpasses the present powers of the astronomer. Not that it is necessary to assume in the latter case the existence of any central body of surpassing bulk and dignity. The exact point round which millions of stars may revolve may not only be destitute of all signs of imperial importance, but it may not even be indicated by a single handful of matter. Nature does not always set up a memorial to indicate the spots where the most momentous actions are performed: the earth's surface is not pierced by any visible object where the axle of rotation might be supposed to protrude; nor is there any external peculiarity to denote the places where the magnetic poles are to be found; and as little is there any furrow or ridge in the ocean to represent the equatorial belt which divides the two hemispheres.

Digitized by Google

This focal point, however (if such there be), was considered by Struve to lie between the stars π and μ in the group Hercules: Argelander fixed upon Perseus as the empire-constellation of our astral system, whilst Madler hoisted the royal standard upon the most brilliant of the Pleiads, Alcyone. Here, then, is one of those stupendous facts which seem every now and then to drop down upon us from the firmament with such overpowering effect. Nothing can appear more placid and motionless than yonder silent stars. Let the astronomer gaze at them till he grows gray, and yet he can detect no symptom of disorder in their ranks. But this vast army of worlds is perpetually on the march, its shining battalions never bivouacking for a single night, but steadily pursuing their way across the celestial fields, without waking a single echo throughout the universe.

But, figuratively speaking, there is a dark side as well as a bright side to the sun. The very properties which enable it to fill our planet with life appear to deprive it of the privilege of cherishing life upon its own surface. Since spectroscopic research has shown that the body of the orb may be charged with heat of extreme ferocity, it is impossible that organized creatures, even of the most salamandrine qualities, could breathe its scorching atmosphere, or tread its burning marl. It is precisely this hypothesis of an obscure and unheated nucleus, says M. Guillemin, which is no longer admissible.

In the fact, therefore, of a glowing nucleus, many a fine philosophical dream has received its death-blow. More than one speculator has calculated the prodigious population which our sun could accommodate, and has pictured to himself the wonderful activities of which that globe must be the scene if every thing there were conducted upon a scale of metropolitan magnificence. And verily there are men to whom it will seem a discredit to the system that its noblest orb should be a desert, so far as life is concerned, that its central mass, surpassing in volume the entire troop of planets and satellites not less than 600 times, should be incapable of harboring any manifestation of that great property which is the glory of our nether world. Let not such good souls despair, however. The sun's turn will doubtless come. Its first forms of life have yet to be born, but the birthday of organization will assuredly arrive; and when its little Oldhamia or Lingula, or whatever character its opening animal productions

Digitized by Google

may assume, shall creep into existence, there will doubtless be great rejoicing among the sons of the morning.

Upon what premises, however, can we base such a presumptuous speculation? Chiefly upon the fact that the system exhibits bodies in different stages of development. Take our own globe, for example. It is clear, from the story told by its rocks, and in particular from the igneous character of those which have been ejected from below, that our earth was once in a state of intense heat, as its core may be to the present hour; that it was shrouded in a dense atmosphere of vapor and aerial fluids, and that consequently it was utterly unfit to accommodate the organisms which now swarm upon its surface. It was then, we may assume, what the sun is now. But having cooled down more rapidly than the latter, as it necessarily would—having passed through fire and water, in its stormy apprenticeship, and eventually acquired a firm consolidated crust—it opened its doors to life, and creatures came tramping in as they did into the diluvial ark. So it may fare with the solar orb. Finding as we do the same elementary substances there as here, and compelled as we are to believe from the movements of the whole system in one plane and one direction, that there has been a unity of origin and of primitive experience, if we may so speak, it is difficult to suppose that processes which have transpired, or are transpiring in one member of the family may not apply to the rest. The moon, so far as observation extends, is an untenanted orb. In all probability its inherited caloric has been mostly expended, or at least the superficial portion has been dissipated, and the residue lies hid in its interior. Consequently its day of life may have closed, and our beautiful satellite may be but a shining sepulcher and a worn-out world. Perhaps it was only an ephemeron amongst stars? Our turn, also, may come; and when life is waking up in the sun it may be dying out on the earth. Let us not, however, think dolefully of the universe, if we find proofs of change or even symptoms of "decay," for in nature nothing is lost, and life is ever born of death. True Science, like true Philosophy, always gives us more than she takes; and with the same breath that she tells us worlds may cease to palpitate, she tells us also that the forces which gave them all their vitality can never be crushed into nothingness except by the hand of Him from whom they emanated.

There are several other poin s connected with this "soul of

Digitized by Google

surrounding worlds" upon which it would have been pleasant to touch, but narrowing space warns us to conclude, particularly as we devoted some attention to solar phenomena in a recent article on the Language of Light. Before parting, however, from the great luminary, we cannot forbear to remind the reader that we are indebted to this generous orb for light by night as well as by day, for warmth within doors as well as without. We are accustomed to speak of the sun's light and heat as forces actually garnered up in the vegetation of ancient epochs. We look upon our coal strata as cellars in which sunbeams have been locked up for unnumbered ages, in order that they might ultimately be re-issued for the benefit of the intelligent tenantry for whom the world was intended. In a certain qualified sense this is perfectly true: coal is unquestionably invested sunshine. The gentle warmth we draw from our domestic fires, the fiercer heat which cooks our food or melts our metals, are the product of the sun's energy exercised upon the earth during some of those silent centuries when the globe was in preparation for man. Strolling through a town lit up by innumerable lamps, or whirled along at the heels of a locomotive, it is a pleasant thought that the emanations of suns which rose and set millions of years ago—which rose and set in seeming idleness, and to all appearance in wasted splendor—are now reproduced to enable us to cope with darkness, or to conquer space without moving a muscle. There is something captivating in the thought that the great *rector mundi* was working for us when as yet there was no sign of man—indeed, no promise of his coming, and with quiet patient labor laying up from day to day those treasures of light and heat which are infinitely more valuable to us than all the gold and diamonds we possess. No one who has studied geological processes can repress a feeling of surprise, perhaps of impatience, at the slow, deliberate step with which Nature ever marches up to her goal; but when we think of the sun toiling in lonely splendor to store our planet with fuel—we had almost said with his own embodied beams—it seems to reconcile us in some degree to the august and awful chronology of the universe.

A passing analogy may not be unacceptable. If, in a modified sense, the light of ancient suns may be hoarded up for ages, so may the odor of ancient seas. Some years ago, a writer pointed out to the Academy of Sciences at Paris, that the shells of the

Digitized by Google

teredo when found in the fossil-wood about Brussels gave out when scratched, or when newly extracted from the soil, a strong scent of the ocean. But of what ocean? Clearly of one on which no human sail had ever been spread, for it belonged to the distant œocene era. After countless centuries had elapsed, the subtle aroma of that pre-historic sea was released from its imprisonment, and played upon nostrils fashioned in this our nineteenth century, as if it were the perfume of a flower plucked yesterday. It brings the ages together to find that from a fossil comes forth fragrance which has been impounded for millions of years, and that from our coal measures we can draw matter which may be called the solidified sunshine of the world's youth.

In conclusion, let us add that the greatest of physical paradoxes is the sunbeam. It is the most potent and versatile force we have, and yet it behaves itself like the gentlest and most accommodating. Nothing can fall more softly and more silently upon the earth than the rays of our great luminary,—not even the feathery flakes of snow which thread their way through the atmosphere, as if they were too filmy to yield to the demands of gravity like grosser things. The most delicate slip of gold leaf, exposed as a target to the sun's shafts, is not stirred to the extent of a hair, though an infant's faintest sigh would set it into tremulous motion. The tenderest of human organs—the apple of the eye—though pierced and buffeted each day by thousands of sunbeams, suffers no pain during the process, but rejoices in their sweetness, and "blesses the useful light." Yet a few of those rays, insinuating themselves into a mass of iron like the Brittania Tubular Bridge, will compel the closley-knit particles to separate, and will move the whole enormous fabric with as much ease as a giant would stir a straw. The play of those beams upon our sheets of water, lifts up layer after layer into the atmosphere, and hoists whole rivers from their beds, only to drop them again in snow upon the hills, or in fattening showers upon the plains. Let but the air drink in a little more sunshine at one place than another, and out of it springs the tempest or the hurricane, which desolates whole regions in its lunatic wrath. The marvel is, that a power which is capable of assuming such a diversity of form, and of producing such stupendous results, should come to us in so gentle, so peaceful, and so unpretentious a guise. It is as great a wonder as if the cannon-balls which were to batter down a fortress danced through

Digitized by Google

the air on their mission of death like motes in the sunbeam, or as if shrapnel shells were bred in the atmosphere like drops of dew, and demeaned themselves as meekly, too, until they exploded.

DEBATE AT DALLAS CITY, OREGON.

PRES. W. K. PENDLETON:—A debate between Prof. L. L. Rowland and Rev. J. B. Calloway, a presiding elder of the M. E. Church, occurred near Dallas City, Oregon, June 13–16th, 1870, involving the discussion of *The Action* and *The Subject* of Christian Baptism.

Mr. Calloway is an experienced debater, and enjoys the hearty endorsement of his denomination as "chief of his Conference." He labored earnestly and faithfully, and was supported by two prominent ministers of his church. His arguments, though not original, were carefully culled, well arranged, and cautiously presented. He began the onslaught with much courage, but after the first few efforts, he exhibited thorough discomfort, which soon changed into depressing discouragement, and finally culminated in chagrin, venting itself in vulgar and insulting epithets. These, however, were passed by with the most provoking silence. It was eminently apparent to the non-committed that he grew quite conscious toward the close of the 4th day that his cause was weak.

Prof. Rowland wielded the sword of truth with veteran skill. His characteristic suavity of address, fairness in debate, earnestness of manner, well-timed repartee and irresistible logic, won and controlled the audience through the entire debate. That portion of the congregation which would scatter abroad during the efforts of his opponent, would, on his rising, gather in from the outskirts and listen with mute attention till the closing word.—He was remarkably self-possessed and courteous during the most exciting parts of the debate, which was owing, perhaps, to his extensive and varied experience as a teacher, and which contributed much to his success.

His arguments and refutations were so systematically arranged and presented, as not only to defy successful attack, but also to force conviction to the most unwilling heart. His peculiar style

Digitized by Google

also enabled him to bring forward much more matter during a given time; since a long argument was often syllogistically stated in a few words. In this shape, it was much more easily retained by the hearer, and consequently more interesting. Such a course, too, is beyond the reach of the most cunning sophist.

His arguments for immersion from the original Greek, were the most satisfactory that I ever heard. Those also in refutation of the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches, were, in many respects, boldly original, and so far as appears, absolutely irrefutable. Indeed, this was one of the most complete successes we ever witnessed.

After the close of the debate, three intelligent and prominent persons (one a member of the Methodist Church) were immersed, and, from the most reliable indications, many more will soon follow.

Prof. Rowland is a graduate of Bethany College, which is an impressive illustration of the great good which that noble institution is doing for the cause of general science and primitive Christianity. Be not surprised if many more of Oregon's sons shall soon seek the same blessings of Bethany. M. A. M.

COVETOUSNESS.—Of all the evils, to use no harsher term, which afflict frail humanity, I set the evil of covetousness down as the chief. It is now, if it has not always been, the great masterly curse of the church. All the works written by infidels, together with all the speeches they have ever made against the cause of Christ, have been as nothing in comparison with the injury it has sustained from the single sin of covetousness.—*M. E. Lard.*

Imaginary evils soon become real ones by indulging our reflection on them; as he who in a melancholy fancy sees something like a face on the wall or wainscot, can, by two or three touches with a lead pencil, make it look visible, and agreeing with what he fancied.

Men's lives should be like the day, more beautiful in the evening; or like the summer, glowing with promise, and the autumn, rich with the golden sheaves where good works and deeds have ripened on the field.

Digitized by Google

NEW IDEAS OF OLD THINGS.

BRO. W. K. PENDLETON:—I am sixty-five years old, and though of a very moderate education, I have ever dared to exercise my own mind. The art of believing by proxy I have never learned.

In early life I had difficulty in understanding the scriptural use and meaning of the term everlasting. The definition given in our dictionaries was unsatisfactory, and many living instructors tried in vain to satisfy my mind on that subject. I once concluded that I never should understand it until eternity revealed it, and under this conclusion I remained quiet for several years, thinking but little about it; but riding with a preaching brother one afternoon going to meeting, we had a conversation on a subject that involved that term, and I expressed to him my difficulty in understanding it. He tried to explain it to me, but it was of no use, for his explanation was about such as I had had before, and he did me no good. This, however, set me to thinking about it again, and I concluded to try it once more on a new plan. That plan was to divest myself of all prior notions on that subject, and read the Scriptures, knowing nothing, and observe how it was applied and how it came out. Now as this term occurs frequently in the covenant made with Abraham, I chose that as my place of reading, and having prepared myself the best I could, according to my resolution I began and pursued the exercise. The result amused me, for new ideas proceeded from an old book, and in due time I came to a conclusion respecting the scriptural use and meaning of this term, which has ever since been satisfactory to myself. In my own language, it is this: Everlasting is a term used to compare the duration of something with the duration of something else, and it implies that the former will last equal with the latter, as in the phrase, These shall go away into everlasting punishment. Here the duration of the punishment is compared with the duraiton of the subjects of it, and it implies that they will be punished as long as ever they last. According to this rule, this comparison is made with things of short duration and things of long duration. If that with which the comparison is made is of short duration, that which is called everlasting will be of short duration also, and if that with which the comparison is made is of long duration, that which is called everlasting will be of the same duration; as

Digitized by Google

In Daniel 12: 2, 3: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt; and they that be wise shall shine as the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Here it should be remembered that the righteous shall put on immortality; therefore the comparison is made with an immortal body, and it implies that they will have life while ever immortality endures. In other words, it implies that life will never, never leave our immortal bodies as it does our mortal bodies. In all cases the measure of the duration of that with which the comparison is made is the measure of the duration of that which is called everlasting.

But a satisfactory conclusion of the scriptural use and meaning of this term was not the whole result of my humble reading; for in examining for the use and meaning of this term, I came to the conclusion that the church of Christ constitutes the fourth generation of the seed of Abraham. This was a new idea, and having obtained the object which I set out to seek, I was now at liberty to withdraw my mind from that subject and attend to the other curiosities which presented themselves, And so I continued this mood of reading, watching over myself continually lest preconceived ideas should interfere and cloud my understanding. After long protracted examination of the covenant and other corresponding texts of Scripture, I became confirmed in the idea, and found that it led to the disclosure of the meaning of an important text of Scripture, which is undergoing many interpretations. I expressed my new idea to others, who seemed to hear me with amazement, and said that they would like to see it in print, so that they could examine it at their leisure, for their minds had never been directed in that channel. I then concluded to write the idea and send it to Bro. Alexander Campbell for his consideration and criticism, and I expressed my intention to my friends, who requested that I should let them examine it if he published it, and I promised them that I would. So I accordingly wrote it and sent it to him, and he published it in June, 1860. He entitled it, The Genealogy of the Messiah, and commended it to the special attention of his readers, without expressing any opinion of its correctness or incorrectness, but represented himself as an inquirer also. I received it in due time, and shortly after I had received it and before I had performed my

Digitized by Google

promise to those who were desirous of examining it, I showed it to a preacher, who, after reading it, requested a loan of it till he would examine it, which I granted, on condition that he would return it to me again. But he has not returned it. Whatever may be the cause of this failure, it has had the effect to seclude the idea from my friends, who desired to see and examine it, there being no other copy of it in this vicinity. It has had the effect to prevent me from having it examined by others and hearing their suggestions.

Now the object of this letter is to appeal to you if perchance you can obtain a copy of it and reprint it, and send me several copies of it.——Fraternally, JAMES EVANS.

At the request of Bro. Evans, we republish the article for which he calls, with the prefatory remarks of A. C., written at the time:

"THE GENEALOGY OF THE MESSIAH.

"*The genealogy of the Messiah, as respects his person, and the genealogy of the covenants of promise, as respects the drama of Redemption. By James Evans.*

"This curious document, as some will consider it, is worthy of special attention on the part ot the amateurs of sacred history—and especially the covenants connected with the redemption of man. Its author, the time when written, and the place whence it hails, are alike unknown and unknowable to myself. We can, therefore, without any prejudice against it or prepossession in favor of it, give it an impartial consideration. We have, time and again, in other formulas of expression, descanted upon the Divine covenants, and still more deeply penetrated with the importance of the contents of these charters, we commend the subject to the special attention of our readers. A. C."

"BRO. A. CAMPBELL.—It is not without timidity that I take up my pen to advance an idea to one who, I know, is far in advance of me in the knowledge of the Bible. Since many men of fame for their abilities, natural and acquired, have spent their lives in criticising the Bible, and no one, to my knowledge, has come to the same conclusion with myself upon the point I shall now introduce.

Digitized by Google

"It seems natural to conclude that one who has spent his time chiefly in manual labor, whose education is not sufficient to enable him to express his thoughts grammatically, and whose name is scarcely known save among those of his personal acquaintances, should abandon the thought of advancing an idea, should lay his hand upon his mouth and content himself with being taught. But as the idea, if correct, serves to farther illustrate the harmony of the Holy Scriptures, and show their consistency with themselves, and, so far as my knowledge extends, is lost to the world, I cannot be reconciled to confine it within my own bosom, though it should be imperfectly expressed.

"The subject to which I would invite your attention is that of the *generations* of the seed of Abraham.

"We read in the fifteenth chapter of Genesis that God said unto Abraham, 'Know of a surety, that thy seed shall be a stranger, in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred years. And also that nation whom they serve, will I judge; and afterward shall they come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.'

"As I know of no difficulty in understanding the first part of this portion of Scripture, my remarks will be confined to the latter clause, viz:—'But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again: for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.'

"To identify this fourth generation is my object. But as we cannot work without means, our first object will be to find a rule by which the generations of the seed of Abraham may be identified. For this, I go to the covenant made with him recorded in the seventeenth chapter of Genesis: 'And I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give to thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.' In this covenant I regard as of much importance the phrase, '*thy seed after thee.*' Here God promises Abraham that he will establish his covenant with his seed after him in their generations for an everlasting covenant. From this it is evident that when God

Digitized by Google

covenanted with Abraham he did not at that time covenant with his seed after him, but it was a part of the covenant with him that He should meet his seed after him in their generations, and establish his covenant with them, and be their God.

"The language that expresses this promise conveys to my mind this idea:—'I will establish my covenant, between me and thee, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee.' I will establish my covenant between me and thy seed after thee, in their generations respectively, for an everlasting covenant to each generation with which it is respectively established. The establishment of this covenant was to be repeated to each and every one of the generations of the seed of Abraham, and it was to be everlasting in its institutions respectively and severally. So no establishment of the covenant with any one generation extended to a succeeding generation, without the presence of God to officiate in establishing it to that new generation.

"Under this view of the subject, I undertake to identify the generations of the seed of Abraham, by the establishments of this covenant, holding each succeeding establishment a sure and unmistakable mark of a new generation.

"But before we proceed to this demonstration, I would show a difference between the generations of Abraham and the generations of the seed of Abraham. The difference, however, does not consist so much in the materials of which the generations are composed, as in that of the different causes governing the same materials into generations differently. Yet there seems to be some difference in the materials, for all the members of the generations of Abraham are eligible to membership of the generations of the seed of Abraham, but all the members of the generations of the seed of Abraham are not, and cannot become, members of the generations of Abraham. The generations of Abraham are his successive proceeds, according to the flesh, according to the fashion of this world, but the generations of THE SEED OF ABRAHAM, are his successive proceeds according to the spiritual promise after God's order of the plan of salvation. The generations of Abraham are confined to his family according to the flesh, but that of his seed are composed of all families of the earth. The generations of Abraham are governed according to the flesh, but that of his seed are governed according to the scepter. The changing of the scepter from one personage to another, which places

Digitized by Google

it in new hands, brings about a new generation of the seed of Abraham, and, according to the promise God made unto him, requires a new establishment of this covenant, which was invariably performed, without a single exception. Of the generations of Abraham, St. Matthew's account amounts to forty-two down to Christ, *i. e.*, fourteen from Abraham to David; fourteen from David to the carrying away into Babylon, and fourteen from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ; making in all, *forty-two* down to Christ. But of the generations of the seed of Abraham, I know of no mention in the Bible of more than four, and if I am right, four is the entire number, which I will now proceed to try to prove.

"Genesis 17—19, 20, and 21, 'And God said, Sarah, thy wife, shall bear thee a son indeed, and thou shalt call his name Isaac, and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him. And, as for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation. But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee, at this set time in the next year.'

"So God accordingly established his covenant with Isaac.—Therefore, Isaac and those that were in the covenant with him (whether they be of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh or not, so they are in covenant with God), constitutes the first generation of the seed of Abraham. He next established his covenant with Jacob. Therefore Jacob and those that were in the covenant with him constitute the second generation of the seed of Abraham. He next established it with the children of *Jacob*, converted into *Israel*. Therefore, the house of *Jacob* converted into *Israel*, constitutes the third generation of the seed of Abraham. As it is written in Psalm cv. 8, 9, 10, 'He hath remembered his covenant forever: the word which he commanded to a thousand generations. Which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac: and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law: and to Israel for an everlasting covenant.'

"Now let us enumerate the establishments of the covenant here specified. Which covenant he made with Abraham, (one); and his oath unto Isaac, (two); and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, (three); and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, (four). Here are four establishments of the covenant, and three genera-

Digitized by Google

tions, it being established once with Abraham the father, and three times to his seed after him in their generations. In the third generation, the scepter was reposed in Judah, and Jacob prophesied, 'The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet until Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be.' In that the scepter was retained in Judah till Christ come, the third generation continued until that time, (though this period of time run past many generations of Abraham, yet the covenant was not established any more from the time it was established with the house of Israel, until it was established by or through Christ, and the third generation of the seed of Abraham continued,) and the children of the covenant were called the Israelites, the children of Israel, &c.; in other words, they were Israel's children and Judah's brethren, according to the covenant, until Christ came. I presume you have anticipated before this time where I came out. The new covenant is the fifth establishment of God's covenant for an everlasting covenant, it being established once with Abraham the father, and four times to his seed after him in their generations. As it is again written in the Psalms, (xxii. 30, 31): 'A seed shall serve him, it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation. They shall come and shall declare his righteousness unto a people that shall be born that he hath done this.' Therefore Jesus said, 'Verily I say unto you, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled.' Inasmuch as Jacob said, the scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, till Shiloh come, and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. With regard to the duration of the third generation, even so Jesus said, this generation shall not pass till all these things be fulfilled with regard to the duration of the fourth generation. As long as he continues to sit at the right hand of God making intercession for us, so long sons and daughters will continue to be born unto God, which makes them Christ's and Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise. For the fulfillment of the prediction, read Galatians iv. 28, 29, then turn to Matthew, ch. 23, vs. 29 to 36.—With much respect, I subscribe myself, your brother in Christ, JAMES EVANS."

REMARKS.

Our ingenious Brother Evans is mistaken in thinking that his view of the meaning of everlasting is new. It is one with which

Digitized by Google

every Greek scholar must be familiar, and one which has been frequently appealed to in the discussion of its use in the Scriptures. His view of the meaning of the word generation is altogether unwarranted by the language of the passage to the explanation of which he so ingeniously applies it. The passage in Genesis xv. is most explicit. The seed were to be strangers—captives—for four hundred years (precisely 430 years—see Ex. xii. 40 & Gal. iii. 17). Their captors were to be then judged, and after this, when the iniquity of the Amorites should have become full, though Abraham himself should not live to see it, his seed, in the fourth generation, which appears to have been a general expression for 100 years, should be brought back to the land in which Abraham was then sojourning—and it should become theirs. All this was most literally fulfilled, and the promise in its language, unequivocally defined by the history of its fulfillment.

W. K. P.

PROTESTANTISM COMPARED WITH CATHOLICISM.

CHAPTER FIRST.

NATURE AND NAME OF PROTESTANTISM.

In the midst of civilized nations stands a very solemn fact—solemn because of the nature of the thing to which it relates, the number, variety and importance of the results to which it leads; and, of the highest interest, because we find it linked with the principal events of modern history: this fact is Protestantism.

Brilliant at its beginning, it at once attracted the attention of all Europe; on the one hand it spread alarm, on the other it excited the most lively sympathy. It developed with so great rapidity that it did not leave even its enemies time to strangle it in its cradle; it only needed to be born, and that moment all hope of arresting or restraining it was lost. Emboldened by a general leniency and respect, it acquired greater audacity every day; exasperated by rigor, it openly resisted the measures of coercion, or, more strange still, it called in its forces and concentrated them to renew the attack with greater violence. Discussions and profound investigations, the scientific display that it was necessary to make in order to contend with it, contributed to the develop-

Digitized by Google

ment of the spirit of inquiry, and thus served it as a vehicle for the propagation of its spirit. By creating new and productive interests, it made for itself powerful protectors; by throwing all the passions into a frightful tumult, it irritated and stirred them up in its favor. It brought into play, by turns, cunning, force, seduction or violence, accordiug to the diversity of circumstances or opportunities. It undertook to open for itself a highway in all directions, breaking or turning the barriers according as they offered it resistance, or it could convert them to its advantage. It never stopped in a country without having first obtained from it guaranties securing it stability and duration, and in fact it obtained these everywhere. After having conquered in Europe the vast establishments which it still possesses there, it was transported into other parts of the world, and inculcated into the veins of peoples simple and confiding.

For the purpose of estimating a fact at its just value, in order to embrace its varied consequences and conveniently appreciate the influence which it has exercised, it is necessary to inquire whether the principle which underlies it can be discovered, or, at least, whether we can observe, in the physiognomy which distinguishes it, some characteristic feature, that reveals its inherent nature: an inquiry, certainly, very difficult when it concerns a fact such as that with which we are occupied. About such questions, in the course of time, accumulate a multitude of opinions, all of which have sought argument for their own support. The observer, in the presence of so great a number and of such a variety of objects, stands confused; and, if he wishes to place himself at a more convenient point of view, he finds the ground encumbered with materials to such an extent that he knows not how to open a road through without running the risk of losing himself at every step.

After the first glance that we cast upon Protestantism, whether we regard it in its present state or whether we follow it in its different phases through history, we perceive that it is extremely difficult to find in it something constant, something which can be assigned as forming its essential character. Unsettled in its faith, it modifies it without cessation, and changes it in a thousand ways; vague in its tendencies and floating in its desires, it attempts every kind of form and enters upon every kind of road. It can never attain a well determined existence, and we see it, ev-

Digitized by Google

ery instant, enlisting in new directions in order that it may be inevitably hedged in by new labyrinths.

Catholic controversialits have followed it and pressed it on every side; ask them with what result? They will tell you that they had to contend with a new Proteus, which, in changing forms, eluded, continually, the blow ready to reach it. Attack Protestantism on its doctrines, and you do not know where to direct your arrow; because you never know, and itself does not know, what are its doctrines. So that, on that side, Protestantism is invulnerable, because it has no body that you can strike. For this reason no one has ever fought it with a more suitable weapon than that employed by the immortal bishop of Meaux: Thou changest, and that which changes is not the truth. A weapon justly feared by Protestantism, and certainly worthy of being so, because all the transformations which they attempt in order to avoid its strokes only serve to render them more sure and more rough. What justice in the thought of this great man! At the bare title of the work Protestantism ought to tremble: *History of Changes.* A history of changes is the history of error.

These unceasing changes, which we ought not to be astonished to find in Protestantism, because they are of its very essence, indicate to us that it is not at all in possession of the truth; they reveal to us also that the principle which moves and disturbs it is not a principle of life, but an element of dissolution. We have uselessly asked it even to this day to place its foot somewhere, to present a body compact and uniform. Could fixity agree with that which, by nature, floats in the vagueness of the air? Can we form a body, of some degree of solidity at least, of an element whose essence is to divide its parts without end, by diminishing the affinity which unites them?

It is easy to understand that I am talking of *the private examination of matters of faith*, whether we submit to no other light than that of reason, the right to judge, or permit the particular inspirations of heaven to intervene. If there is anything constant in Protestantism, it is, without doubt, this spirit of examination, it is the substitution of private opinion for public and legitimate authority. This is always found united with Protestantism, and is, to speak properly, the most essential ground of its nature: it is the only point of contact among all the sects, the ndation of their resemblance; and it is very remarkable that

Digitized by Google

this takes place, most frequently, without design, sometimes against the express wish of the protestants.

However detestable and dark this principle may be, if the chiefs of Protestantism had made of it their rallying signal and had constantly supported it by their conduct and doctrine, they would have been at least consequent in their error. As we had seen them precipitating themselves from abyss to abyss, we had recognized without doubt the effect of a bad system; but, good or bad, it was a system. Not even this was done by them. Examine the words and deeds of the first innovators, you will observe that this principle of predilection was for them a mean of resisting the authority with which they felt themselves pressed, but that they never thought of establishing it as a foundation: that if they labored to overthrow legitimate authority, it was for the purpose of usurping command; in a word, that they followed the march of revolutionists of every kind, of every age and of every clime. No one is ignorant as to what degree Luther carried his mad intolerance, he who could not suffer the least contradiction from his disciples, or from whomever it might be, without delivering himself up to the most senseless rage or the lowest abuse. Henry VIII, the founder, in England, of that which is called *freedom of thought*, sent to the scaffold whoever did not think as he did; and it was at the instance of Calvin that Michael Servetus was burned alive at Geneva.

If I insist upon this point, it is because it seems to me important that it should be well established. Man is naturally too aspiring: in hearing repeated unceasingly that the innovators of the sixteenth century proclaim the independence of thought, some minds without suspicion would conceive a secret interest in favor of the innovators; they would come, thence, to regard their declamations as the effect of a generous movement, and their efforts as a noble endeavor to clothe the intelligence with its rights. Let it be known, however, never to be forgotten, that if these men proclaim the principle of free inquiry, it is for the purpose of making of it a support against legitimate authority, but that so soon they will strive to impose upon others the yoke of their own doctrines. Demolish the authority which comes from God, in order to establish upon the ruins of this authority their own, such has been their constant design. Nothing would be more easy than to furnish the proofs of these assertions: these proofs, testi-

Digitized by Google

monies of shame for the founders of Protestantism, present themselves in abundance. But we do not know how to report them without repeating words and facts of such a nature that the tongue hesitates to articulate them, and the paper seems soiled as we commit them to writing.

Seen in a mass, Protestantism presents but a shapeless assemblage of sects, all opposed among themselves, and agreeing in one point alone: *The protest against the authority of the Church.*— Among these sects we find nothing but names particular and exclusive, derived ordinarily from the name of their founder; in vain they have tried a thousand times to give themselves a general name which would express a positive idea: we designate them still after the manner of the sects of philosophy. Lutherans, Calvinists, Zwinglians, Anglicans, Socinians, Arminians, Anabaptists,—all these names, of which I could unroll an interminable chain, show clearly the narrowness of the circle in which these sects are shut up, and it is sufficient to pronounce them to perceive that they cannot be rendered into anything universal or grand.

Every man who knows however little of the the Christian religion, ought to be convinced by this single fact that these sects are not truly Christian. But that which is altogether remarkable is that which happens when Protestantism wishes to give itself a general name. Run over its history, you will see that of all those which it has successively tried, none fits it, if it presents a positive idea, if it contains something Christian. But what if it did happen to apply a collective name at a risk, in the diet of Spire, a name which carries in itself its own condemnation, because it opposes the origin, the spirit, the maxims, the entire history of the Christian religion; a name which expresses neither unity nor union, nothing, consequently, of that which is inseparable from the Christian name, this name suits it marvelously: all the world with unanimity, by acclamation decrees it for it; it is because this name is truly its own: *Protestantism.*

In the vague space designated by this name, all the errors find their place, all the sects are accommodated. Deny, with the Lutherans, the liberty of man, or renew, with the Arminians, the errors of Pelagius; admit with the one the real presence, which you are at liberty to reject with the Calvinists and the Zwinglians; join the Socinians in order to deny the divinity of Jesus Christ; unite with the Episcopalians, or Puritans, or, if it please you, de-

Digitized by Google

liver yourself up to the extravagances of the Quakers; it is no matter, you will always remain a protestant, because you protest against the authority of the Church. This field is so large, you cannot get out of it without difficulty, whatever may be your wanderings: this is all the vast expanse which we discover when we are placed outside of the Holy City.

A VISIT TO NEW ENGLAND.

I have just returned from a visit of six weeks' duration among the churches of New England. It was the accomplishment of a long-cherished desire to see the land, the people, the ways and the industries,—and above all, our churches, of the Eastern States. I had never before put my foot on the "sacred soil" of the Pilgrim Fathers. My visit extended as far as Lubec and Eastport, in Maine, and Deer Island, in the edge of the Bay of Fundy, in the British dominions. It was to me altogether one of the pleasantest tours, as it was through one of the most interesting parts of our great country, and was made in the company of my wife, and under the direction and guidance of Bro. Belding, of Troy, New York, an old and cherished friend, who planned the trip, and who, above any other, was best fitted to be our guide among our brethren of New England. We cannot be too grateful to our good brother, whose geniality, kindness, fervent zeal, wisdom and prudence, knowledge of the churches and high estimation among them, made these six weeks so pleasant and profitable to us. Brother Belding is welcomed everywhere by the brethren with warm love, as one known to them, and who is appreciated by them for his earnest, unselfish devotion to the cause of the Master.

We met Bro. Belding, waiting for us, at Troy, New York. From this point our tour began, and here also it terminated, so far as visiting the churches and preaching is concerned. In our journey eastward, starting from Troy, we visited Worcester, Boston, Swampscott, Ayers' Village, Durham and Bangor,—by rail. Thence by post-conveyance, as we would say in Europe, changing horse and carriage at intervals, and being our own Jehu, we made a delightful two days' drive directly eastward, through the sea-coast forests and hills and among the innumerable beautiful lakes

Digitized by Google

of Maine, to East Machias, a distance of about a hundred miles. This was one of the finest parts of our whole tour,—indeed, we all agreed to give it the preference above all others. The whole distance, from Durham, New Hampshire, through Portland to Bangor, by rail, and thence, as we said, to East Machias, we made without stopping to preach, as there are no churches on this long route. The last place named was our first point of destination in Maine, on the remote northeast sea-coast of that State. This point is reached easily by ocean steamer from Portland in a very short time. If any one asks why we did not take the shorter and every way more convenient and expeditious route by sea, Bro. Belding, on application, will give a full and satisfactory answer. With all his fine imagination, our good brother, like some other people we know, has never been able to appreciate the charms of

"The sea, the sea, the open sea!"

and

"A life on the ocean wave,
And a home on the rolling deep,"

has never been able to win his heart; not that he cannot feel the raptures of the glorious sea,—but to heighten these raptures, as a true philosopher, he seeks for and has realized the sublime truth, that

"*Distance* lends enchantment to the view."

After East Machias, where we stayed over two Sundays, we went to Lubec, the extreme point of our destination. From here we made visits to Eastport, and also to Deer Island, in the province of New Brunswick, where we have a goodly number of brethren, and where we met a good and attentive audience on a Monday night. Starting homeward from Lubec, myself and wife took the sea to Portland, while Bro. Belding, true and firm to his convictions and instincts, and to his philosophy, as above explained, retraced his steps over the same route we had come, via Bangor. We met again at Durham, New Hampshire, where we stayed over a Lord's-day, preaching. We passed again through Boston, and made a rest over night among the brethren at Worcester. Thence, by the Hoosac Tunnel route, we returned to New York State, stopping at Pittstown, where we staid over two nights, preaching to the church. Our stay here was at the delightful and truly

Digitized by Google

Christian home of the sisters Sherman, one of whom is Sister Belding, whom we met here. This is one of the bright spots in our pilgrimage, not soon to be forgotten. From thence we went to Troy, the especial field of Bro. Belding's labors for a long time. Bro. Osborn now preaches to the church. Here, by appointment, we staid over Sunday, preaching several times. Brother Belding accompanied us, in pursuing his work for the New York State Mission, down the Hudson river, as far as Poughkeepsie, where we bade him adieu. The following day, we reached home, thankful to God for his kind preserving care,—for His hand had been with us to guide, to protect and to keep, through this long journey of two thousand miles,—and grateful to him also for his preserving care over the flock we had left at home.

Thus much only of the route;—in another number we shall speak more particularly of the churches and the cause in New England.

C. L. L.

THE NAMES OF THE MOST HIGH.

There is a name which the Jews dare not write or pronounce, the ineffable name cherished in crypts and cloisters and sanctuaries of the Hebrew spirit, but not to be uttered by the lips, or spelled out by letters. Superstition has more to do with this than profound reverence, though we are far from denying that veneration mingles with the baser element. Referring to this special name, the Talmud says, "Whoever utters the name of God with its own letters, hath no part in the world to come." In like manner Josephus wrote, "The name of God is a name not lawful to be uttered." We are so far from sharing in this mystical reserve, in the hush of twilight glooms, that we could imitate the ancients and join some great host of worshipers crying out with loud voice, Extol Him by His NAME JEHOVAH! The great sin is committed! we have written the name, and if Talmudic doctrine be sound, the gates of the Holy City are closed upon us! Some time ago a swarm of critical locusts from Germany settled upon the living green things of the Pentateuch. There was much noise about Elohistic and Jehovistic documents, and the supposed *yths* were divided by schools and ages. But a strong wind has blown them into the dead sea, and the country of life once more

Digitized by Google

blooms with primeval luster. We knew, the most of us, before this irruption, that the time arrived in the wondrous working of God when the name Jehovah became more appropriate and significant than Elohim. The great Potter wrought a work on the wheels, and as the wheel went round we beheld at the right time the exceeding glory of that great and adorable name. We are not past it yet, nor can we reach any such stage of development; for the period has not yet arrived so vividly described in Numbers xiv. 21: "And Jehovah said, I have pardoned according to thy word, but truly as I live, all the earth shall be filled with the glory of Jehovah." If we follow, as we may safely do, the corrected text and version of Dr. Kennicott, we have in the *last words* of David a splendid prophecy of the supreme sunrise in the coming of Jehovah:

> "The just one ruleth among men,
> He ruleth by the fear of God:
> As the light of the morning ariseth Jehovah,
> A sun without clouds for brightness,
> And as the grass from the earth after rain.
> Verily thus is my house with God,
> For an everlasting covenant hath he made me,
> Ordered in all things and sure:
> For he is all my salvation, and all my desire."—2 SAM. xxiii.

It is Jehovah who swears by himself that unto him every knee shall bow, for in him there is righteousness and strength, and the name by which he will be called in the kingdom of Justice will be, Jehovah our righteousness. Isaiah beheld the glory of Jehovah, and John applies the passage to our anointed Savior; but in fact, the passages all center in him, for he is the one to whom every knee shall bow and every tongue confess, and he is our righteousness now and evermore. Of course the beauty of holiness, which is hidden glory, shall one day burn out into external and triumphal power and splendor, and the victory of Jehovah be undeniably manifest. He is the Deliverer and the One Who Will Be. He has appeared once, and finished one great work, and to them that look for him will appear a second time without sin unto salvation.

There is another name which God assumes in relation to a certain defined class of people, which is unspeakably sweet and precious: "Behold what manner of love THE FATHER hath bestowed

Digitized by Google

upon us that we should be called the sons of God." "Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be, but we know that when he shall appear we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is." John iii.

(a) Israel as a totality—Israel collectively, was a son; hence the word of the Lord to Pharoah: "Israel is my son, even my first-born—let my son go that he may serve me." But though the unified people stood in such relation, the individuals did not.—Sonship was reserved for the Regeneration or the New Birth, and the second birth is distinctively Christian. No twice-born man until the advent of the Redeemer, and the mission of the Comforter. He came to his own and his own received him not; but to as many as received him to them he gave the power or privilege of a new birth. The best men of Judaism in common with the worst had to be born again. The man in Christ was a new creature, not merely standing in covenant-relation—for that was old—but supernaturally quickened. Not by culture or philosophical advancement, not by stoical self-denial or moral reformation, "not by righteous works which we had done, but according to HIS MERCY He saved us—by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Spirit."

(b) There is an affluence in the love of God which no language may declare. Behold what manner of love! See the measure—"Herein is love." Inspired men of God only lisp and stammer on the shores of a fathomless sea. In fact it must be so, for love, human or divine, is not eloquent with words, but has more power with signs, and symbols, and broken exclamations. The intellect can enlarge and amplify in the matters which concern her province, for reason has a copious vocabulary—but the heart has no dictionary.

(c) But as to this name Father—it belongs to the inner circle, and concerns the life within the life. With mere philosophers, God is little more than a shadow on the dim shores of immensity and eternity. Among men of science who have not reasoned themselves into Atheism, he is a wonderful machinist and builder, quite astonishing in conception and execution, having piled up the architecture of the heavens and laid the foundations of the earth. It is likewise darkly perceived by men generally that some sublime and almighty one intervenes occasionally in the moral world. Some invisible power who must have personality

Digitized by Google

and intelligence, takes the work out of the hands of the earth-born laborers, and brings out results which never entered into human calculation.

But none of these conceptions minister consolation, or prevail with regnant power in dominating over life and action. They are all outside ideas or concepts, and leave men in practical atheism. God is never truly revealed save in that charmed circle of sanctity and holiness where the Father is known through the Son and in the power of the Spirit. "Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son, crying, Abba Father." The Lord of hosts—the Almighty—the world-builder—the great and terrible one, no longer appals by his dreadful power or dismays us by his distance, but he comes near in fullness and infinity of love. The hearth-stone—the solemn confidence—the family love—the well-grounded and ever-springing hope, are all so precious; and they all grow from the new supernatural relationship. The presence of God, the power of the Spirit, the manifestation of Christ, are not mere words, or figures of speech, but the deepest of all realities. These guests are all pledged not to lodge in the house for a night, to tarry with a man for a day, but to abide in the place forever. "We will come unto him, and make our abode with him."

(d) Then as to the future—in the mere school of nature, or house of the flesh, the wise and the foolish are very much alike. The strong, the rich, the valiant, the beautiful, go down into the common grave, and no man is seen returning. Resurrection from the dead is incredible as ever to the natural man. Death is here, and death is there, and death is everywhere—but life restored is not in the range of his vision. The caravan, so richly freighted with human glories, passes continually through the desert, and calls at one shadowy house from which the merchants come back no more. O ye gods! is this the end of all?

It is quite true that sons are the only heirs: now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that when He appeareth we shall be like him, for we shall see Him as He is. This calm and deep conviction—which is as an anchor for the soul—is no deduction of reason, or discovery of philosophy. It belong entirely to supernaturalism and to Faith. We believe in The Life manifested. "I am the resurrection and the life. He that believeth in me, though he were dead yet shall

Digitized by Google

he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die." Such words of power were never uttered since God said, "Let there be light—and light was." They could neither have been conceived nor uttered by a mere mortal man. It is the voice of a God. "Lord, if thou hadst been here my brother had not died." True, sweet Martha—deeper truth than you apprehended. In his absence we die—in his presence we shall live. The resurrection from the dead—the resurrection of life—though rooted in miracle, is now a spiritual necessity. In the immediate presence of the Lord, all who belong to him by ransom and holiness, must live! Mortality and death vanish as dreams of the night. The morning sun glorifies the earth, no more to go down. We shall be like Him for we shall see Him as He is. But the glory in which he *is*, and is to be revealed, and in which we are to share while the ages roll on, is beyond all human speech—though the hope, as a great fire at the center, gives life and impulse to the whole moral nature.

G. GREENWELL.

"THE LIVING ORACLES."

We have received from the publishers, Bros. Franklin & Rice, a beautiful copy of a *fac simile* edition of this valued work. It is a reprint from the last edition ever published by Father A. Campbell. It has been long out of print, and there are many who will feel under lasting obligations to Bros. Franklin & Rice for its republication. It is finely executed, and as a "Family New Testament," should be in every household. To many, who for years past have written to us about this work, we are now happy to say, they can be supplied by orders sent to the office of the *Christian Review*. We hope that the enterprising publishers may be speedily and amply rewarded for this valuable offering to the wants of the brethren.

W. K. P.

☞ THE well-known volume, "LIVING PULPIT OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH," will soon be issued in a cheaper form, and sold for $3.00 a copy. We learn that this new edition will contain all the matter of the original five dollar edition, besides retaining all the steel portraits. The w rk will be sold by agents.

Digitized by Google

"CHRISTIAN HYMN AND TUNE BOOK."

This is a work which has been prepared by Bro. A. S. Hayden, with a view to promote congregational singing. We have looked over its contents, and find it full of the choicest sacred music that the age affords. Bro. Hayden has taken great pains and displayed good taste in grouping the words and tunes together, and from the cursory examination which we have given it, we feel warranted in commending it to the general use of the brethren. How much we need to cultivate a soul-stirring church music! May we not hope that Brother Hayden's book will do much to bring about a higher musical culture in our worship? It is of moderate size—271 pages—and is well printed by the enterprising publishers, Root & Cady, of Chicago, Ills. W. K. P.

"THE HOCKER FEMALE COLLEGE."

We call especial attention to the circular of this school, located at Lexington, Ky., and presided over by our brother Graham.—Though only one year old, it is already an eminent success. As we expected, Bro. Graham has, with the aid of his accomplished co-laborers, given the fullest satisfaction to a very large patronage. We hear the warmest encomiums expressed by those who ought to know, not only upon the President and Faculty, but upon the entire establishment and its management. Merit will win success, and we feel assured of a growing popularity and patronage for this elegant and already highly popular college.

W. K. P.

Good Words from Our Correspondents.

COLUMBIA, Mo., Aug. 8, 1870.

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON.—Yesterday I spoke to a good audience in Columbia; there were three additions; one gentleman confessed the Savior and was straitway immersed, and two took membership who had not long since obeyed the gospel. On Saturday I was at Skull-lick, in Audrain county, where Bro. Mountjoy, assisted by Bro. Crisman, had been conducting a meeting for 8 or 10 days; when I left there had been 37 additions.

Digitized by Google

Bro. Mountjoy is doing good work as district Evangelist, in the missionary cause. He is now nearly over three counties in the district, and has not visited a church that has not accepted the 'Louisville plan,' as it is called. They have shown their faith by their liberal donations to aid in the good work of preaching the gospel to dying men. The amount raised exceeds all expectations in this district, and I believe it is true in every district where an effort has been and is being made.—Missouri will make a good report on this subject, despite the public announcement to the contrary, and the continued growling and fault-finding of a few. Affectionately your brother,

T. M. ALLEN.

RUSHVILLE, IND., Aug. 17, 1870.

BRO. PENDLETON:—My meeting at Louisville closed after four weeks with 60 additions. Our last meeting was held in the central church, and was a grand reunion of all the churches.

Long shall I remember the Louisville Christians for their hearty co-operation and liberal support. Would to God we had many more such preachers as those with whom I formed an acquaintance there. The three churches cannot but prosper under the pastoral charge of brethren Hopson, Dawson and Keith. God bless them all and all others.

The good sisters of Louisville presented Mrs. Shaw with a beautiful set of silver, worth about $75.00, for which she could scarcely find words to express her gratitude, little dreaming of being so remembered by comparative strangers.

I preached 2 weeks in July in New Albany, with 26 additions, and the bringing about of a much happier state of feeling than we found. Bro. Parker is now their pastor, and I anticipate for them a glorious future.

There have been, under the labors of your humble servant, since last report, at different points, about 325 additions. Praise the Lord—let all adore him. Praise his name forevermore.

Your brother and fellow-servant, KNOWLES SHAW.

OBITUARIES.

Died, at the residence of her father, in Columbia, Mo., after a brief illness, on the evening of the 24th July, 1870, about 5 o'clock, Mrs. MARY E. ALLEN, daughter of Eld Thos. M. Allen, and widow of Robert M. Allen, deceased, aged 43 years, 4 months and 20 days.

She died calmly, without a struggle, as the sun goes down at evening. Having had before her the example of that devoted man of God and eminent minister of the Gospel, her father, and enjoyed the instructions of a pious mother,

Digitized by Google

like Timothy, she had known the Scriptures from her childhood, and early gave her heart to God. She obeyed the Gospel at sixteen, and from that time to her death, walking in close communion with Christ, she illustrated and adorned, in spirit and life, her confession.

As is well known to her numerous friends and acquaintances in this and other States, for near seventeen years she had been an almost constant sufferer, and at the time of her death was a hopeless invalid. Life for her had long since lost its attractions, and only her deep affection for her aged father, whom she adored, and for an only brother, bound her to earth. She was patiently waiting till the Great Father above should, in his mercy, think proper to call her.—Naturally mild and amiable, under the chastening hand of Him who makes us perfect through sufferings, the Christian graces of meekness, gentleness, resignation and universal charity, shone out resplendently in her character. During all the long and weary years of her suffering, she was never heard to complain or murmur; never manifested the least impatience or restiveness at her lot. Ever gentle, ever patient, her face was at all times as placid as though she had been a stranger to suffering, and beamed with a radiance soft and sweet, as if light from the Heavenly world had filled the temple within and was reflecting its shekinah upon the outer walls. A sweeter or more angelic face, I never looked upon. If God chastens every son and daughter whom he loveth, and if suffering is evidence of heirship and fits the child of earth for the companionship of Heaven, then truly our sister was ripe for the sickle, and the Father moved by love only has sent his angels to bear her home.

Deeply sympathetic and keenly alive through her own sufferings to the sufferings of others, she was ready with her means, and liberally so, to "every good work." No plea for the destitute or needy but found in her an interested and sympathizing auditor, and at her hands ready relief. And even in her death, she was not forgetful of the orphan, nor of a world lying in sin and wickedness, but in her last testament made gracious provisions, which will cause many, in years to come, to rise up and call her blessed. Truly she hath laid up in store a good foundation; of the mammon of this world, she hath made to herself friends, even God, the Infinite Father, and Christ, our Elder Brother, who have now received her into everlasting habitations. How worthy her example of all imitation! How applicable the words of the inspiring Spirit: Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth; yea saith the Spirit, they rest from their labors and their works do follow them.

We cannot close this notice without tendering to our aged and venerable brother, the father of the deceased, the sincere sympathy and condolence of the community in which he has so long lived, and which as citizen and as a faithful minister of the Gospel he has so eminently served. It were needless to commend to him the consolations of that religion which for near fifty years he has been, by word and life, recommending to others.

To the bereaved brother and sorrowing relatives, we say, sorrow not, but rejoice that she has gone to her reward; cherish her memory and imitate her example, that your end may be like her's. J. K. R.

☞ How blessed to die deserving the beautiful tribute which is so justly paid to the memory of this excellent lady. To my venerated brother T. M. Allen,

Digitized by Google

her devoted father, I tender my warmest sympathy. I know well how tenderly he loved and cherished this noble woman, and now that he is nearing the Jordan by reason of years and many labors, he must feel the loss of one so loved as irreparable. How forcibly the beautiful sentiment, "Not lost, but gone before," comes to us in these partings; and when we know the time must be short, at the longest, it makes us all the more earnestly pray for and hasten the day of His "coming." How many, in after years, shall rise up and bless the memory of both father and daughter. W. K. P.

Brother Wm. M. Baker departed this life at his residence, near Gordonsville, Orange co., Va., on the 6th of September, 1869.

He was born on the 10th of March, 1799, and therefore was in the seventy-first year of his age. When about eighteen years old, he was attacked by a severe bronchial affection, from which he was never relieved; but by leading a temperate and prudent course, and taking moderate exercise on his farm, he attained to a good old age, and with the blessing of God, raised seven children, four of whom still survive him, as does his loving and devoted wife, with whom from early manhood he had lived in so beautiful and lovely a manner, that the poet might well imagine:

"Angels looked on with tender gaze,
Well pleased to see them spend their days,
And bade them live and love."

But death finally broke the golden chain and left our sister to mourn the absence of her long-loved husband; but not to sorrow as those who have no hope.

Bro. Baker was baptized by Eld. J. W. Goss, on the eleventh of September, 1842, and though prevented by a partial loss of voice, and the lack of physical strength, from taking an active part in the church, in his home life was seen the excellence of the principles that controlled him.

For some months previous to his death, though suffering but little pain, it was evident that his system was sinking, but his mind was calm and serene; and trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ, he met death without fear, and calmly closed his eyes on earth and earthly things. "Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright, for the end of that man is peace." R. L. C.

Died, near New Cumberland, W. V., on the 4th of August, 1870, DINAH BAKER—familiarly known to the congregations in this part of West Virginia as "Aunt Dinah"—aged 70 years.

This humble and faithful woman was for many years a member of the church at Bethany, and won the love and esteem of all by her upright and consistent walk and conduct. She was a slave in early life, but had been for many years free. Politically free, she became the Lord's bondwoman, and devoted herself to his service with unremitting zeal. Her seat in the sanctuary was never empty—her voice never silent during the service of song. Her Redeemer was all in all to her; and having fought the battle of life and endured faithful to the end, He has taken her to be with Himself, in the mansions where toil and suffering and weariness are known no more. To those who knew and loved her she has left the rich legacy of a pure and blameless life. "Though dead, she yet speaketh," and in example lives.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24·00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Turkey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

Dr. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding - , -	25	Extra Cloth, - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edges - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. V

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., SEPTEMBER, 1870. [No. IX.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

A LECTURE.

No attempt of the human mind to form an adequate notion of God independent of revelation has ever been successful. The different attempts that have been made to prove the existence of God are generally conceded to be "formally invalid in a syllogistic point of view." There are but two lines of argument by which man has sought to rise to a knowledge of the existence and nature of God. One is by a contemplation of himself—the other by a contemplation of the world. These have been designated severally the ontological and moral, and the cosmological and the teleological arguments. Neither, apart from the testimonies of revelation, leads to a true and adequate knowledge. Evidently they cannot rise above their fountains. The knowledge derived from each must be conditioned by the knowledge we have of data from which we draw our inference. If we know the world, in its principles and phenomena, imperfectly, we can derive from this knowledge but a correspondently imperfect knowledge of God. And if our knowledge of man be superficial and inadequate, so also must be the idea of the God of man, whose nature and existence we deduce from such defective data of reasoning.

The cosmological argument has been called the *argumentum e contingentia mundi*, "the argument from the contingency—the

Digitized by Google

transitoriness of the world." Because all earthly things come and go,—rise and fall,—pass as shadowy phenomena through shifting fields of transitory existence into dissolution and death,—having no permanent existence in themselves,—therefore, they must have their existence in something else,—a ground of being,—not contingent;—the absolute one, of whom all things else are but modes, having in himself potentially all modes of being, and unfolding himself infinitely in all forms of phenomena of which the universe consists. Man himself, lives and moves and has his being in him. He is the life of the universe, eternally unfolding in transitory existences, and as fast and eternally annihilating himself in one form to reappear in another. This is oriental pantheism—modern Spinozism.

The ontological argument is precisely similar. It starts with the phenomena of consciousness, and abstracting from every determinate form and subject of thought, simply thought in the abstract, the mind falls back upon the pure and absolute ground of thought, which is God. The changing variety of thought is but the unfolding of this hidden and eternal ground of thought. Without this, consciousness is impossible. To be conscious of self is to be conscious of truth; but God is pure truth; therefore to be conscious of self is to be conscious of God.

As the cosmological argument leads us to a God who is "mere power and necessity," so the ontological argument leads us to one who is "pure truth." Neither notion is satisfactory to the soul. "A Being," says Morell, "to whom understanding, will, and even personality is denied; a being who does not act but simply *is*, who does not act but simply unfolds, who does not purpose, but brings all things to pass by the necessary law of his own existence—such a being cannot be a father, a friend, a benefactor,—in a word, cannot be *a God* to man, for man is but a part of himself." (p. 128 Hist. Mod. Phil.) Neither gives us any actual knowledge of God.

The teleological argument is based upon the discovery of design in the order of the universe. Every end is in turn a means to something else. The order of nature is one of endless adaptations. Nothing completes its own existence without contributing to the existence of something else. Every part is linked, by a wonderful harmony of interdependence, that induces the conclusion of an all-pervading, indwelling, organific soul, which is God

Digitized by Google

evolving himself; God immanent, *natura naturans.* [But this order of the world and the spirit of the world are identical. Both in matter and in mind, it is the plastic energy of a Demiurgos developing himself as a final result. There is nothing to love, nothing to worship, for there is no relation of contrast. Each part is God in the act of evolving himself. It cannot be distinguished, save as we distinguish a part from the whole. All the parts make up the world, and the world is only the self-realization of the absolute idea, which is God. They are but two aspects of the same unity. Evidently this is not an adequate notion of God.

The moral argument is only a subjective application of the teleologic. The ontological God does not satisfy the moral nature of man, which demands a moral government of the universe. Contemplating man's moral nature, we rise to the notion of a moral governor, as the ground, the absolute essence of this phenomenon. The moral order of the universe is the self-evolution of this idea, which finds the ultimate end, the final cause, in itself. God and moral order are one. The final end is the good and progress of the whole. Nothing is of value save as it works to this result. The end of the individual is only to promote and subserve the general good. God has no existence to us, save as he is manifested in our own moral endeavors. Sacrifice and suffering are to be endured or inflicted without mercy or remorse for the general good. The absolute moral idea controls, with iron despotism, all things for itself. Between man and this God there can be no relation or feeling of love. The God we love is only ourself. Humanity is God evolving himself—and "what the God-inspired man does is God."

None of these notions rises in kind above the basis upon which it is built. We stop not here to consider their philosophic inconsistency, however; our object in referring to them is to show, not only that they are not adequate to the wants of the soul in its religious cravings and spiritual aspirations, but that they are essentially atheistic. Pantheism in all its forms is a denial of a personal God; and to deny a personal God is to deny God altogether. This has been long seen by philosophers; it is now practically felt by the common scoffers at Christianity. Nature is substituted for God—the order of nature for the law of God—and the uniformity of nature plead as a sufficient demonstration of the

Digitized by Google

falsity of Christian miracles and the impossibility of a verbal revelation to man. Science is set against faith, reason against revelation, geology against religion. Force takes the place of the Logos, and through the microscope, shows itself a veritable creator.

In polar antithesis to these rational notions of God stands the dogmatic Theism of the Jewish Scriptures. They present to us God, not as a notion of the human mind derived through contemplation of itself or of the world without, but as a personal Being, revealing himself, and by actual manifestation declaring his own nature and demonstrating his own power. He sets himself before us as distinct from creation, which is indeed his own work, but not himself. Not to recognize this contrast is heathenism. Paul makes heathenism to consist in this, that man "changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever" (Rom. i. 25). This antagonism lies at the threshold of all religions. There are but two scientific systems. We must be Pantheists or Theists. We must settle down into a worship of the derived Absolute, or we must rise to that of the original Absolute. Revelation presents us with the one,—human speculation, in its blind, weak heathenism, leads us to the other.

It is not too much to say, that there is in man a natural yearning after a personal God, what Paul calls ψελαφᾶι (Acts 17:27), a *feeling* after him, and most reasonable it is that he should reveal himself to this seeking of the human heart. He has created in us a desire, a longing for himself, that when the answer of his revelation comes, we may at once recognize and accept him. As light is to the eye, sound to the ear, taste to the palate, so is the revelation of God to this yearning of the soul. The want creates the expectation of the revelation, and when it comes, we accept it as the sufficient and blessed answer to the soul's demand. Its own manifested reality is its sufficient demonstration. But as in nature experience comes before science, so in religion faith precedes the construction of doctrine. We believe first, we philosophize afterwards. In the first days of Christianity, the disciples demanded no proof of the existence of God. They attempted none. The idea had been a recognized one by God's people for four thousand years. Long ago it had been written, "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Long ago God

Digitized by Google

had appeared in thunderings and lightnings upon Mount Sinai and delivered his law;—long ago he had spoken by prophets precious promises of the Christ to come, and now, by signs and wonders, demonstrations, not of reason or logic, but of power—of his own personal presence in the Spirit, he reveals himself in the person of the Son,—and how absurd to turn away from all this splendor of light, and attempt to prove by ingenious reasoning, what was sensibly manifest to all. They thought of nothing so foolish. If men could not see God it was because they were blind.

This axiomatic ground as to the Existence of God is beautifully set forth by Theophilus ad Autolycum (A. D. 170–180). He answers, "If thou sayest, Show me thy God, I answer, Show me thy man, and I will show thee my God. Show me first whether the eyes of thy soul see, and the ears of thy heart hear. For as the eyes of the body perceive earthly things, light and darkness, white and black, beauty and deformity, &c., so the ears of the heart and the eyes of the soul can perceive divine things. God is seen by those who can see him, when they open the eyes of their soul. All men have eyes, but the eyes of some are blinded, that they cannot see the light of the sun. But the sun does not cease to shine because they are blind; they must ascribe it to their blindness that they cannot see. This is thy case, O man! The eyes of thy soul are darkened by sin, even thy sinful actions. Man must have a pure soul, like a bright mirror. If there be any rust on the mirror, man cannot see the reflection of his countenance in it: likewise if there be sin in man, he cannot see God."

Still, while for themselves, this innate response of the consciousness to God's revelation of Himself was constantly appealed to, as a sufficient answer to the question concerning the existence of God,—both apologetically and polemically, they did not altogether reject the physico-theological, or teleological proof. Their use of this argument, however, was rather popular than scientific; an argument in confirmation, not for the discovery, of the existence of God. Thus this same Theophilus, speaking in this sense, says, "When we see a vessel spreading her canvas, and majestically riding on the billows of the stormy sea, we conclude that she has a pilot on board; thus from the regular course of the planets, the rich variety of creatures, we infer the existence of the creator." Again, Minucius Felix (A. D. 224–230) makes a similar use

Digitized by Google

of this argument: "We indeed believe in God from this, that, while we cannot *see* him, we can perceive him. For, in his works and all the motions of the world, we behold his power always present. If you should enter a house and see all things cultivated, arranged and decorated, certainly you would believe that a head presided over it, and from these good things, more likely that it was a woman: so in this house of the world, when you consider attentively the heaven and the earth, providence, order, law, believe that there is a head and parent of the whole, more beautiful than the stars and the parts of the world." But while this use was made of this argument, it must be remembered that it was rather "the sudden utterance of an overflowing heart, giving vent to its feelings in a rhetorical form," than the logical construction of a demonstration. It was the grateful recognition of a God already known, in these manifestations of his presence.—Both Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 212–220) and Origen (230–254) frankly acknowledged the impossibility of a proper proof of the existence of God, and contended for the necessity of a divine revelation. (Hag. 95). The more artifiicial ontological and cosmological proofs were not used by the early Christians at all.—Practically, they influence only the smallest order even of philosophic minds.

Planting the knowledge of the existence of God, then, firmly upon the rock of revelation, let us see how this knowledge unfolds itself in the subsequent ages of the church. During the age of Polemics (A. D. 254 to 740), from the death of Origen to John Damascenus, it became quite the fashion to set forth independent proofs of the existence of God. The physico-theological proof was appealed to by Athanasius and Gregory of Nazianzen; the cosmological by Diodorus of Tarsus, and the ontological by Augustine and Boethius. It must not be understood, however, that these fathers made the proof to rest on these arguments alone, or that they conceded that the doctrine of the existence of God was not a matter of Revelation. We should rather regard these efforts at these independent methods of proof, as an indication of a fullness of conviction, which overflowed in attempts to reach by philosophic reasoning that which they already knew by revelation; for once establish the idea of revelation, and then it is easy to see confirmations of it everywhere. But these philosophic proofs are not the ground of popular conviction. To the masses

Digitized by Google

the belief is yet received axiomatically—or upon its historic announcement.

The age of Polemics was followed by the age of Systematic Theology (from 730 to 1517). It was in this period that the proofs of the existence of God were developed under the high claims of philosophic demonstrations. The cosmological proof was developed by John Damascenus—the ontological by Anselm of Canterbury. These methods of argument might be and were very entertaining to the scholastic divines, among whom they did not originate but were only revived and more philosophically stated, but they were not suited to be the ground of popular religion, and hence the "doctrinal writers soon returned to the historical fact of a divine revelation to men, as a starting-point in their systems, and thus necessarily presupposed the metaphysical existence of God." Hag. II. 316. After the time of Kant (A. D. 1787), the philosophical methods were generally abandoned, and they are now but little heard save in the schools.

Of these proofs generally we may take our leave in the language of the great metaphysician of Konigsburg. In his opinion the existence of God can be proved on speculative grounds only in a three-fold manner; either by the physico-theological, or the cosmological or the ontological argument. The ontological proof is not admissible, because its advocates confound a logical precedent with a real. "A hundred real dollars do not contain any thing more than a hundred possible....But in reference to my property a hundred real dollars are more than the mere idea of that sum (i. e. of possibility)....The idea of a supreme being is in many respects a very profitable idea; but because it is a *mere idea*, it cannot by itself enlarge our knowledge of that which exists; for a man might as well increase his knowledge by mere ideas, as a merchant augment his property by adding some cyphers to the sum total on his books."

In opposition to the cosmological proofs, he urged that its advocates commit an *ignoratio elenchi;* i. e., they promise to show us a new way, but bring us back to the old (ontological) proof, because their argument is also founded on a dialectic fiction."

In reference to the physico-theological proof, he says: "This argument is always deserving of our respect. It is the earliest, clearest, and most adapted to common sense. It enlivens the study of nature, from which it also derives its existence and ob-

Digitized by Google

tains new vigor. It shows us an object and a design where we should not have discovered them by independent observation, and enlarges our knowledge of nature by making us acquainted with a particular unity whose principle is above nature. But this knowledge exerts a reacting influence upon its cause, viz., the idea from which it derives its origin, and so confirms the belief in a supreme creator, that it becomes an irresistible conviction. Nevertheless, this article cannot secure apostolical certainty; at the utmost it might prove a *builder of the world*, but not a *creator of the world*." Crit. Pure Reason: 3rd Div. Sec. 4, 5, 6.

Abandoning, therefore, the speculative grounds as wanting in "apostolical certainty," Kant rested the argument for the existence of God on the ground that it is a postulate of the practical reason, the rational conscience, that is the power by which we cognize *what ought to be*, as distinguished from the speculative reason, or power by which we cognize *what is*." "As there are practical laws which are absolutely necessary (the moral)—if these necessarily presuppose any existence as the condition of the possibility of their *obligatory* force—this existence must then be *postulated*, for this reason, that the condition, from which the conclusion proceeds to this determined condition, must itself be cognized *a priori* as absolutely necessary." Crit. p. 437. Now morality and a degree of happiness corresponding to it, are the two elements constituting the supreme good. But the virtuous do not always attain it. There must, therefore, be a compensation in the world to come. At the same time there must be a being that possesses both the requisite intelligence and the will to bring about this compensation. Hence the existence of God is a postulate of the practical reason. Hag. ii. 416. This is the method and the argument of Kant. It claims only to be a practical proof, and like the physico-theological, may be used with good effect even before popular assemblies. These two proofs have, particularly, suited the turn of the English mind. Paley's Natural Theology is a fine development of the latter, and its great popularity in our colleges and universities demonstrates the satisfaction, at least, that the method gives to the religious mind of the age. The wonderful advances in physical science furnish constantly new and startling illustrations of design, and the theologian does well to wrest these from the hands of infidelity, and marshal them in the service of religion. This was the idea which

Digitized by Google

gave birth to the Bridgewater Treatises. It is in this field that many are now seeking to bring science and religion into irreconcilable conflict, and we cannot turn away from it as altogether unworthy of our earnest thought. While God, the author of revelation, is also the creator of nature, there can be no conflict between the two. The one must illustrate and enforce the other, and both be made to speak to us of God.

Through all the life of the church, then, we find the doctrine of the personal existence of God recognized as a clear historic fact, revealed to the intuitional power of the soul in divers manners, and received by the great body of the disciples without question upon its simple announcement, and, therefore, treated as axiomatically true. In addition to this, several scientific forms of proof have also come down through the ages, helping to confirm and establish the doctrine in the minds of philosophers, and against speculative skepticism, and in a beautiful manner enlarging our conceptions of the power, wisdom and goodness of the Creator. But, however ingenious and profound or plausible these proofs may be, it is, after all, only the God of Revelation that is accepted at once by the universal heart, as satisfying the earnest yearning of the soul and filling it with light and love.

This is the God of attributes, not simply an unknown *essence*, but a Being whose *essence* is in his *attributes*, and whose *attributes* are in his *essence*. "The divine attributes are *real* and *eternal* characteristics of the Deity." They are personal qualities. The Pantheist deals with the *essence* without the *attributes*. His God is not the God of the Theist. He strips his God of the very qualities that constitute the essence of the divinity of the Deity, the attributes by which He is knowable, and presents us with a predicateless nomad—ἄβυσσος (abyss)—hidden and fathomless by the human mind. But the God of revelation is gloriously manifested in his attributes; by them we know Him, for them we love Him, and through them we are blessed in Him and made partakers of his fullness.

In the first ages of the Christian church these attributes were not defined with scientific precision. Metaphysics played but a small part in the faith of the disciples, but by degrees, the attributes of God became the subject of the profoundest thought and discussion. To reconcile these attributes with one another in the administration of the affairs of the universe, has called forth the

Digitized by Google

best efforts of the best minds that have adorned the church. We can only allude to them here. We may accept it as the conceded doctrine of the church on this subject, that God is eternal, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, all-wise, just, righteous, good, holy, blessed, and infinite love; that these are not mere conceptions of the mind, forms in which we express our idas of God,—they are objective realities, God's modes of revealing himself, determinations of his essence, of his essential unity, attributes of a person,—existing in Him as objective realities independently of our thought,—"rooted in his inmost essence." These attributes are indeed different aspects, but the same essence. They are distinctions but not divisions. They are not separate from each other, but penetrate each other, as of the common essence of the same divine Ego.

This profound view of the attributes has never been more clearly stated than by Augustine. He says, with the condensed perspicuity for which the Latin language is so remarkably suited: "Propter hoc itaque natura dicitur simplex, cui non sit aliquid habere, quod vel sit possit amittere; vel aliud sit habens, aliud quod habet; sicut vas aliquem liquorem, aut corpus colorem, aut aer lucem sive ferverem, aut anima sapientiam. Nihil enim horum est id quod habet; nam neque vas liquor est, nec corpus color, nec aer lux sive fervor, neque anima sapientia est. Hinc est, quod etiam privari possunt rebus quas habent, et in alios habitus vel qualitates verti atque mutari, ut et vas evacuetum humero quo plenum est, et corpus decoloretur, et aer tenebrascat, et anima desipiat," etc. (De Civ. Dei xi. 10.) This is translated freely to say—"Nature is said to be simple, when it cannot have or contain a thing which it can separate from itself; or having the thing, can be different from that which it has;—as, for instance, a vessel has any liquor, or a body, a color, or the air, light or heat, or the soul, wisdom. For none of these is that which it has; for neither is the vessel liquor, nor the body color, nor the air light or heat, nor the soul wisdom. Hence it is, also, that they can be deprived of the things which they have, and be turned and changed into other states and qualities, as the vessel is emptied of the liquor by which it was filled, and the body of its color, and the air of its light, and the soul of its wisdom," &c.

While, then, in thought we may distinguish these attributes, we cannot separate them without destroying the essential unity of

Digitized by Google

the nature to which they belong. They cannot act in conflict with each other. Their perfect harmony is the peace of God and the peace of his universe. "Love is their center and vital principle. Wisdom is its intelligence; might its productivity; the entire natural creation and the entire revelation of righteousness in history are means by which it attains its teleological aims. When the fullness of time came love revealed its true nature to the object beloved, and prepared itself in Christ a church for eternity. And as Christ in His gospel made known to our race the inmost thoughts of His wisdom, so does He make those who believe partakers of his own divine *nature*" (2 Pet. i. 4). (Mart. Ch. Dog. p. 99.) W. K. P.

THE WAR IN EUROPE.—VOICES OF CHRISTIAN WISDOM AND CHARITY IN FRANCE.

In the midst of the high civilization of the old world and of our age,—a civilization boasting itself as Christian, and as based upon and realizing the highest principles of enlightened humanity, there has broken out, in a moment, in the midst of apparently profound peace, between two great nations, a war of gigantic magnitude, that has already, in the space of a very few weeks, been followed by a sea of blood. It is really something awful to contemplate, that such things can be to-day. If there is anything that does expose the utter hollowness of all these common, proud pretensions of a *human* civilization, boastful of its own strength, and wisdom, and power of self-government,—of its own innate, all-sufficient divinity, arrogant in the high elevations in civilization it has reached,—it is events like these—these awful, sudden outbursts of hellish passions, that come upon us like dreadful, devastating, terrifying thunderstorms in a cloudless sky. It is as if the very gates of hell were suddenly opened, to pour forth its dark and dire woes upon a peaceful world. What a lesson this to all!—what a confirmation of the great truth the Bible has every where so solemnly taught, and that man so obstinately and proudly refuses to recognize,—of the "desperate wickedness" of the human heart, and of the reality and universal prevalence and the "exceeding sinfulness" of sin, among men, and of its Satanic

Digitized by Google

origin and character. What is man, even in his highest estate, when left to the impulses of his own flesh, his own "passions and lusts," but a human demon! Here, to-day, in the afternoon of the nineteenth century after the rising of the Star of Bethlehem over the world, by the mere play of passion, in the hearts of a few men comparatively, whole regions in the very center of the *enlightened* world have been swept by a storm of desolation, and whole generations of men sent into the grave! This is *man!* and man with his brother *man!*

In the midst of the wild cries of nations infuriated against each other, and of the no less godless and treacherously tortuous and deceitful intrigues of diplomacy, it is consoling to hear the voice of Christian faith, Christian courage and charity, daring to make itself heard in the very midst of the wild commotions of human passions. The following noble words were written and published in Paris, at the very hour when the war was decided upon and declared. They are from the pen of de Pressense, one of the most eminent Protestant writers of France, and published in the August number of his journal, the *Revue Chretienne*. To show forth the significance and Christian bravery of his words, we give also his own description of the declaration of war in the Chambers, on which these words are a comment:

"Two events of immense moment signalize this month,—the declaration of war between France and Prussia, and the proclamation of infallibility at Rome. Of the causes of this war,—the policy which has induced it, we can no longer speak. The most elementary duty of patriotism, is to put an end to all such criticism when so formidable a crisis has begun. The week which preceded the rupture between the two countries has been full of the most poignant emotions and the most cruel uncertainties.—Within the space of an hour, we passed from peace to war, although the latter appeared already decided upon from the first declaration of the minister of foreign affairs, which already smelt of powder. Tuesday the twelfth of July, at the commencement of the session of the legislative corps, the people were already sure of the declaration of war; an instant afterwards the news of peace spread in the tribunes from the dispatch which announced the renunciation of the Hohenzollern candidateship. M. Ollivier had read it in the lobbies of the chambers with an undisguised joy, so

Digitized by Google

sure was he that the event had ended. Peace would have been certain, if the government had rested satisfied with this termination; it was the guarantee for the future demanded of the king of Prussia, that has brought thus face to face the two nations, already so greatly excited against each other. Hence was born the conflict. Thursday the fourteenth, there was no more doubt about the war. On Friday it was declared to the legislative body by the demand for the loan necessary for the armaments. No words can describe the somber and excited character of this session. Long before the opening, an immense crowd pressed to the doors of the chamber. A still greater crowd was collected outside, eager for the great news. The pallor of an indescribable anxiety is on all faces. The session commences at one o'clock. There is a silence as of death when the keeper of the seals mounts the tribune. Before he had spoken two words it was known that he was about to announce war. The extreme right applauds with enthusiasm;—the left is motionless. M. Thiers rises and camly expresses a different opinion from that of the government, not on the withdrawal of the Hohenzollern candidateship, but on what has followed. The extreme right interrupts him with fury, and outrages him in the most odious manner;—they shake their fists at him, and charge him with being a Prussian. He replied, "Gentlemen, I will suffer every outrage; you will not prevent me from fulfilling a great duty." He undergoes the same treatment in his reply to the speech of M. Ollivier. The left and the center-left demand the reading of the dispatches which are said to contain the insult to France. The chamber, by vote, refuses the communication of these dispatches. It retires to its rooms to appoint the commission which is to make the report on the credits demanded. The session is resumed at half-past nine in the evening. The excitement is still greater than in the morning. The commission proposes to vote everything demanded, by affirming on its honor that the dispatches are insulting. In vain M. Gambetta urgently demands the reading of the dispatches. M. Ollivier shows the dispatch, but does not read it. The mouths of the eminent members of the left are stopped, their voice is stifled by the clamors of the majority. Nothing in the world can prevent us from protesting against this suppression of the liberty of debate at the moment when it would be most necessary. With such procedures no war could ever be avoided

Digitized by Google

when it would please the sovereign, because it would be enough to desire to examine the motives for it, to be accused of connivance with the enemy. It is thus that the most formidable crisis in our contemporary history has been inaugurated in a parliamentary tempest. In the evening Paris presented a spectacle of the greatest excitement;—bands of men promenade the streets singin g the *Marseillaise.* In the morning you meet only estafettes riding in all directions, soldiers rejoining their corps, artillery going to the stations. Nothing is more exciting than regiments departing prepared for war;—the people accompany them saluting with shouts of enthusiasm; women weep, and the Marseillaise resounds on all sides.

"It is certainly allowed us, without lacking patriotism, to feel the heart oppressed at the thought of this terrible shock which is preparing, and to cry to God to entreat him to shorten these terible days,—and if it is his will to make the plow of ruin pass over our soil, to make to spring up from the bloody furrows the seeds of eternal life. While waiting for the coming conflicts, the true Christians of all communions have great duties to fulfill, without speaking of those among them who are under the banners, and who will be able to show that the faith of Christ only increases true heroism. But first of all, we must remove from our hearts all feeling of hate, and protest against these infamous excitations of a certain press, that has never ceased to distill the gall of hatred, ever since the difficulties have arisen between the two nations. To excite the worst passions as it has done, is to transfer into polemics the poisoned balls which men no longer venture to use in war, and to render future reconciliations more difficult. No civic duty authorizes anger and the spirit of vengeance.

"Furthermore, it belongs to the disciples of the good Samaritan to take the first rank in the holy crusade of charity which is to bind up on the battle-field the wounded of every nation. Our most cordial sympathy is given to the International Society of Relief, which has seen, alas, in a few hours its mission enlarged beyond all expectation. We greet with all joy the formation, at Paris, of a large Evangelical Auxiliary Committee to aid the sick and wounded soldiers, and the creation, at Strasburg, of the Alsatian Committee of Religious Aid to the soldiers. These labors call for the most prompt and generous offerings. May our Samaritans, while binding up the wounds of the body, direct to the Cross the last

Digitized by Google

look of the dying! Great sufferings stir the deepest depth of the human heart, and let us not forget that this deepest depth conceals the spark divine that leaps forth at these violent shocks. Let us not cease, without at any time forgetting the honor of the banner, to send forth our strongest desires and prayers for the most speedy re-establishment of honorable peace, which alone will assure to us the greatest moral blessings,—and first of all, liberty. This latter appears to us to-day more precious than ever; true liberty, without fiction and without falsehood, is it not the mother of peace,—alone capable of preserving it? Away with all spirit of conquest and blustering;—let us be serious in such grave circumstances. Let us not cherish frivolity in the heart, but have it full of Christian confidence and enlightened patriotism; and let us begin with prayers for our country and for humanity.

"There is surely now no place for cherishing pride, when we see force unchained in the midst of this civilization so intoxicated with itself, and which believed it was sufficient for everything.—It is true it has centupled material force, thanks to the formidable engines of destruction created by science. There is no cause of boasting, for war is always barbarism, even under its mask of glory. It should be a great subject of humiliation for humanity. Nothing gives stronger proof of how wretched it yet is, and how fallen. Yes, after eighteen hundred years of Christianity, it is these cannon rumbling to the front, there to vomit forth death, that are the echo to the songs of the angels hailing the birth of Christ by these divine words: 'Peace, peace on the earth! good will among men!' What do you say about this, you optimist philosophers, you flatterers of human nature, you who dare to pretend that it is intact and that it has no need of a redeemer. As for us, we will turn to the Prince of Peace, to pray to him with ardor to have pity on us, and to make to shine as soon as possible over the bloody deluge the sign of deliverance, the divine ray of his restoring love!"

How infinitely superior these pure and lofty sentiments of an enlightened, generous Christian mind and spirit, to the wild passions in the unsanctified hearts of the base slaves of a tyrant's sinful pride and wicked ambition!—and how much better prepared such a noble Christian hero to enter into the dark cloud of na-

Digitized by Google

tional adversity that is so gloomily settling upon his country, than the wicked authors of these terrible calamities—than the great criminal, who, fallen, an exile and prisoner, if he yet has a heart to feel, must be annihilated by the curses of suffering, betrayed millions weighing on his guilty head!

We add to the words of this eminent Protestant, the eloquent language of an eminent French Catholic prelate, whose name has already become familiar to the world by his bold resistance to the infallibility dogma in the Council at Rome,—M. Dupanloup, bishop of Orleans. Immediately upon his return from Rome, on the breaking out of this war, he addressed a letter to his clergy, from which we extract the following passages:

"And, my brethren, never expect from a bishop that he shall admire war! No! in the face of God, who shed his blood to reconcile men, I deplore this mournful mystery of war, and all,—priests and bishops,—we pray every day that it may be avoided, and suppressed even, if possible!

"Who does not feel sad for men so proud of their civilization, and who have not yet been able to blot out war from their history? Who does not feel sad, above all, for Christians, who have not yet been able to advance thus far their gospel, in its power over themselves and others,—and which all the while is called the gospel of peace? Who does not long, with his most ardent desires, for the moment when the nations will replace force and the triumphs of arms by peaceful force and the triumph of right, and at least among Christian nations, by the inviolate respect for justice?

"Alas, alas! when will men cease to exterminate one another, and even in peace to exhaust themselves by the venom of barren hate and the burden of immense armaments? They are crushed by the weight of their mortality, and yet, at times, they seem to hasten to destroy themselves. As if they were not already sufficiently mortal, they invent new deaths; they increase at pleasure the afflictions, already so great, of humanity; and even while I I am speaking, one of the efforts of their genius, one of the most boasted progresses of human industry, is to create engines of murder such as no one before us ever imagined;—it is, at a single blow to multiply the death blows to such a degree that our first battle shall be a new, unknown, strange wonder, which defies all

Digitized by Google

precaution. Ah, for myself, I cannot express to what degree the death, even glorious, of so many thousands of fine and brave young men, weighs with affliction on my soul,—even at the moment when I follow them with my disconsolate admiration! No! Let no one ask me to admire war!

"Do not speak to me of the sublime horror of the cannonade and the prodigies of blind violence; hope not to wrest from me an applause of carnage! But rather tell me that this poor French peasant has given his son without murmuring; that this boy has quitted his hamlet to traverse unknown lands; that he has marched day and night, obedient, silent and cheerful, to attack a redoubt without name; and that there, under fire, he may save a strip of cloth painted with the national colors and which is called the flag of France, he allows himself to be cut down in a ditch; or that, escaped from death, he has come back without reward to take up again, in the paternal furrow, the plow and the spade!"

Yes, it is reassuring to some extent,—it is some sad comfort, at least, to know, that there are all over the Christian lands, souls enlightened enough, and purified enough, to see and understand war in its true light. While the authors of this brutal war are quarreling about national honor, about what is the true, proper, relative proportion, the just equilibrium of States, about what does and what does not constitute insult to nations; while finally one of the chief and most guilty authors of this carnage is reposing, as a royal prisoner, in quiet and in grand state in the romantic, and stately palace of Wilhelmshœhe,—cities, towns and villages, whole wide regions, are in ruins, filled with blood, ashes, famine and general desolation, as the fruits of these royal quarrels. May God have pity on the terrible sufferings of unfortunate people; and may the hour, by God's help, soon come, when rulers will everywhere be held, and feel, directly responsible to the people for their conduct, and receive at the just tribunal of the nations the due reward of their actions! C. L. L.

Fret not thyself because of evil men; neither be thou envious at the wicked. For there shall be no reward to the evil man: the candle of the wicked shall be put out.—Prov.

Digitized by Google

[From the Apostolic Times.]

THE ART OF PRINTING AND THE ORGAN—THE ARGUMENT ILLUSTRATED.

To the Editors of the A. C. Review:

1. Let us suppose that the Art of Printing was as common in the days of the Apostles as it is now; and that both it and the art of Chirography or *hand-writing*, were carried, as at present, to a high degree of ornamental perfection; and that in Jerusalem and other cities generally, there were large quantities of printing material, types, etc., and numbers of printers and others connected with printing offices:

2. And that the Apostles in their publications alluded to this art as one of universal prevalence, and its utility as everywhere admitted, insomuch as that in illustrating certain points of decorum in the churches, they spoke of it thus: "If a printer is unable to decipher a manuscript, and allows himself in setting up an article to jumble its vowels and consonants at random, who can tell what the writer intended to say?" "And if a printer advertises a public sale, without either giving place, name, or date, who will know when, or where to attend? So likewise ye, brethren, except ye speak in terms distinctly, definite and easy to be understood, how shall your discourse benefit any one?" thus illustrating the folly of using words that convey no ideas, by a reference to a universally known art among them;

3. And that, not only some who were associated with the Apostles in the ministry had been recently connected with large printing establishments; but that very soon after the gospel was first preached, "a great company of printers became obedient to the faith;"

4. And that then, as now, books and papers in *print*, were universally regarded as more pleasant and agreeable to read than if they were in manuscript; and that at least, if a document for public reading was necessarily part in *writing*, yet that it was always best that as much as possible should be in *print*, with good, clear type; let us suppose all this;

5. And yet that the Apostles, under all these circumstances, with all the allusions made to this universally known art in their writings, and with all the before enumerated *printing facilities* at

Digitized by Google

their command, they should never in the whole sixty years of their ministry, with all the publications they made, of histories and general epistles, not have a single one of them printed, or even partly printed, and when advising their Christian brethren in regard to their publications likewise, they should ignore the whole affair of printing and enjoin them in words like these: "Let what you have to say to the brethren, be communicated directly in *manuscript*," the same injunctions being sent to brethren and churches in different parts of the country.

I say, if we should find the Apostles under such circumstances thus ignoring the whole matter of *printing* as a mode of publication, notwithstanding its convenience and popularity, and absolutely *prescribing* to the brotherhood at large the *old clumsy manuscript* mode of advertising as *the* mode to be used, even for their ornamental, poetical literature, we might think it "very bad taste," very "old-fogyish," and far "behind the times," and "calculated to drive the young people away from the church," and all that, but, the unavoidable conclusion of every candid mind would be:

1st. That there was something about the art of printing, which the Apostles, in their view of it, regarded as improper as a mode of Christian publication; and that their treatment of it in this way amounted to nothing short of an absolute prohibition, so far as Christian literature was concerned—*yesterday, to-day, and forever;* and

2d. That in all questions of "expediency," as to the lawful use of modern appliances in the line of Christian publications, whether concerning *photography, telegraphy*, etc., the matter of *printing* is wholly out of the question, since that art was in universal practice before the Apostles, and all about them, in Jerusalem, in all Judea, and to the uttermost parts of the earth; and they calmly, quietly turned away from it, and persistently ignored it, swerving not from this course in a single instance during the whole sixty years of their ministry among the churches.

This is the case supposed, and these the inevitable conclusions. We use it as an illustration, and now present the exact counterpart, which we give in the veritable facts of inspired history as follows:

1. Instrumental music was as common in the days of the Apostles as in the present day. It was used everywhere; in the tem-

Digitized by Google

ple, in the camp, on both festive and funeral occasions, and in the domestic circle both among Jews and Heathen; and together with singing was cultivated as an art by all nations and all people. It was ordained of God as a special part of the Temple worship at Jerusalem, and its cultivation and performance was especially assigned to the tribe of Levi and the sons of Aaron: 2 Sam. v. 5; 1 Chron. xv., xxv. and xxvii. 11-13; 2 Chron. v. 12, 13; xxix. 25; Matt. ix. 23; and for the domestic circle, Luke xv. 25; all this showing the vast number of musical instruments and the multitude of performers to play on them in Jerusalem, and in all Judea.

2. The Apostles in their writings alluded to this art as one of universel prevalence, not only among Jews, but also among the Gentiles; and to its practice and utility as a fact with which mankind were generally acquainted, insomuch as that in illustrating certain points of church decorum and edification they spoke of it thus: "And even things without life, giving sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction in the sounds, how shall we know what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet shall give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle? So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?" 1 Cor. xiv. 7-9.

3. Not only some of the leading men of the church, eminent among the Apostles, had been connected with the musical department of the Temple service, as Barnabas, who was a Levite, the tribe consecrated by God to sing and play on musical instruments, but, soon after Pentecost, "a great company of priests (sons of Aaron) became obedient to the faith," who also were divinely appointed to blow on trumpets during the solemnities of the sacrifice. Num. x. 8, 10; 2 Chron. v. 12, 13; Acts iv. 36; vi. 7.

4. It was furthermore, then, as now, that instrumental music was regarded universally as more agreeable and delightful than singing; and that at least, singing to have its best and most inspiring effect, must have its instrumental accompaniment. 1 Sam. xvi. 16-23; 1 Chron. xv. 16, 28; 2 Chron. v. 12, 13. All these being the verities of inspired history.

5. And yet, that the Apostles, under all these circumstances, with all the allusions made to the universal practice of instrumental music in their writings to the churches, and with all the above enumerated musical facilities at their command, should never in the whole sixty years of their labor and worship in the churches

Digitized by Google

have played themselves, or had played by others, on any instrument a single tune, either alone, or as an accompaniment to Christian song; that they should also by their several epistles, in regard to the musical service of God, ignore the whole affair of instrumental music, *pipe, trumpet, harp,* and *organ,* and specifically enjoin them to "*sing, making melody in their hearts to the Lord,*" prescribing the simple, plain, unaffected congregational singing, "grating and discordant" as it might be to the "cultivated ear;" that the Apostles should have thus acted, is wholly irreconcilable with the idea that they ever intended instrumental music to be used in Christian worship.

These facts, then, fairly considered, bring us to these two conclusions, from which there is no escape:

1. That though we may think it "very bad taste," "very old fogyish," and "far behind the times," and "calculated to drive the young people away from the church," and all that, yet that there was something about instrumental music, which the Apostles regarded as improper, either in leading, or accompanying Christian praise; and that their treatment of it thus (leaving "parlor accomplishment" out of the view) amounts to nothing short of absolute prohibition, so far as Christian praise is concerned—*yesterday, to-day, and forever!*

2. And that in all questions of "expediency," as to the lawful use of modern appliances to improve Christian singing, in the church, or in the family, such as *note-books, tuning-forks, troches, lozenges,* etc., however these may be disposed of, the matter of instrumental music is wholly out of the question, since the art was everywhere present before the Apostles, and about them in Jerusalem, in all Judea, and to the uttermost parts of the earth; and they calmly, quietly turned away from it, and persistently ignored it in all its forms and utilities, not swerving from this course toward it in a single instance during their sixty years superintendence of the music of all the churches.

If it is possible to highten the force of these conclusions, we may recur to that Apostolic injunction given for special cases of exuberant joy and thankfulness, called *merriment* in the common version. Jas. v. 13. Consider that this epistle emanated from Jerusalem, and was addressed especially to Jewish disciples, who were all familiar with instrumental music in divine worship, familiar with the psalms of David, and with his mode of express-

Digitized by Google

ing his exuberant joy upon instruments of music of various sorts, Ps. cl.; and consider that this was the direction a Jewish Christian's "merriment" would naturally take; and in view of all this, the specific direction in this matter thus given: "Is any merry, let him sing psalms," is not only *prescriptive*, but also *proscriptive; pre*-scriptive, in enjoining vocal music; and *pro*-scriptive, in forbidding instrumental music, as expressive of Christian praise.

To the question, "Why should the Lord Jesus deliberately abandon the sweet, delightful art of instrumental music, consecrated to religious praise by the Father, ages preceding, and in full practice at the time our Lord established his kingdom on the earth?"—to the question, "*Why*," we have said nothing. We have clearly shown the *fact* that he did abandon it. Out of the *three modes*—sprinkling, pouring (*pouring* in connection with *water* was never practiced under the law of Moses. Both oil and blood were *poured*, but water never. *Sprinkling* and *immersion*, in connection with water, were divinely appointed rites of cleansing under the Law. It is probable that *pouring* water was used as a *human tradition* in the days of our Lord) and immersion, our Lord deliberately chose immersion (in the world's estimate the most *ungenteel*, as well as the most inconvenient of the three) as the initiating ordinance of his kingdom. *Why* he did not choose sprinkling, or pouring, we pretend not to answer, except that it was his sovereign pleasure not to do it. This is, also, our answer in the case of the sweet, delightful, attractive, genteel, fashionable art of instrumental music. The "liberty" which some claim to introduce the one now, is the liberty to introduce the other.

There are but two ways in which the force of the foregoing argument can be *evaded*—for it cannot be fairly and manfully met—and they are:

1. By the assumption, put forth by Abbott in a popular work some years ago, addressed to the question of the *philosophy of Christian ordinances*—"mode" of baptism, etc., which is, *that we are not bound to follow the apostolic mode of doing anything!* This is distinct, candid, honest; the only ground on which the apologists for, and advocates of instrumental music can credibly place themselves, and claim square out, the right to transform the church generally, to "suit the times."

2. The other is commonly expressed thus: "We could not expect, that in the days of persecutions, when the disciples had no

Digitized by Google

meeting-houses, they would, or could set up anywhere such instruments as were used in the Temple service at Jerusalem, an *organ*, for example." This is answered by the fact, that all the instruments used in that day, those of the Temple service included, were *portable*—easily carried about. They were all smaller than many of the instruments of the military bands of the present day; as for example, the "organ." It was no larger than a copy of Campbell's Family Testament, if as large; much more portable, and more easily concealed under the mantle in a flight from persecution, than a copy, a roll, of the Scriptures of that day; very cheap in its production, a dozen of them not costing half the price of a copy of the Scriptures. It was blown by the mouth; very sweet and gentle in its tones, and was as well adapted to worship "in dens or caves of the earth," as in a parlor or meeting-house, and yet, *it was nowhere used in Christian worship!*

The foregoing argument is submitted for the candid examination of our brethren. The *Standard* and *Millennial Harbinger* are requested to give it an insertion in their columns respectively.

S. A.

Danville, Ky., Aug. 25, 1870.

REMARKS.

As requested by Brother "S. A.," we have inserted the foregoing article, that, as he desires, it may be "submitted to the candid examination of our brethren." We have, for some time past, closed, as far as practicable, the pages of the *Harbinger* to the "music question." It has gone on almost *ad nauseam*—till the stomachs of many are getting retchy under the frequent "broken doses" with which we have been so professionally drenched. When will we throw it off, and return again to sweet digestion!

But here is a new argument,—is it—or a new way of putting an old one? In either case, both for its ingenuity and the high regard in which we hold its author, it deserves our respect;—still more would we esteem it, could we see in it "the conclusion of the whole matter." We shall suppose that brother "S. A." and myself both agree, that *historically, it is perfectly clear that the apostolic churches did not use instrumental music in their public worship.* That this is a fact which cannot, with the least show of authority be denied—that no one at all acquainted with the New Testament,

Digitized by Google

or with ecclesiastical history, can pretend to claim for the introduction of instrumental music into the primitive church any *pretense* even of primitive precept or practice,—that, as Chrysostom says, "It was only permitted to the Jews as sacrifice was, for the heaviness and grossness of their souls: God condescended to their weakness, because they were lately drawn off from idols. But now, instead of organs,* we may use our own bodies to praise him withal;" that, as Justin Martyr tells us, the use of singing with instrumental music was not received in the Christian churches, as it was among the Jews in their infant state, but only the use of plain song;—that, even as late as 1250, the "church," as Thomas Aquinas expressly declares, "did not use musical instruments, as harps and psalteries, in the praise of God, lest she should seem to Judaize,"—that, in short, it was not until the period when the grossest secular corruptions had begun to creep into the church, and the world was bordering on the dark ages, that this *innovation* was admitted into the public worship of what is *historically* recognized as the church: we shall suppose, we say, that brother "S. A." and I agree in all this, and then let us proceed to examine the force and validity of his reasoning, as *an argument*—not the merits of the *question*, but the merits of the *argument*, as relating to the *question*. If we could think or feel that this argument is a demonstration, that "it cannot be fairly and manfully met," nor *evaded* even, save in the two ways which are pointed out by brother "S. A.," then, indeed, would we rejoice, and hail it as the crowning work of all this controversy—at once the test of our fellowship and the law of peace. But is it so? We shall see.

1. To what class of arguments does this belong? Brother "S. A." will doubtless be ready to answer, "It is an argument from probabilities." In other words, brother "S. A." finds in the conditions of the apostolic churches *causes* which he thinks were *sufficient* to have induced the apostles either themselves to have played or to have had others play musical instruments; or, at any rate, said something about the relation of such music to the Christian worship, unless there was something about it which they deemed improper. But they utterly ignored the whole question; and the conclusion is, therefore they disapproved and condemned

* These were not our modern "organs," but perhaps the *Syrinx*, or Pandean Pipe, or mouth-organ, a combination of reeds or pipes, of unequal length, which were blown by the mouth.

Digitized by Google

the practice. This is the argument. That it amounts to a *probability*, all must concede. That it is a demonstration, no logician, we presume, will affirm. It is an inference from a particular assumption:—that is to say, out of all the reasons which may be assigned or imagined, why the apostles were *silent about the use of instrumental music in the primitive Christian worship*, this argument selects *one*, and assumes that *this* must be admitted to be the true one. Under the circumstances, this question of instrumental music, it is assumed, must have been thrust upon the apostles; the mouth-organ would claim to be heard; the apostles, by force of custom, would be tempted to play it themselves, or inclined at least to invite the converted Levites to lend their skill in blowing it to the improvement of the church singing. But they did no such thing. They did not themselves play—they did not command nor invite the Levites to play. They are silent on the whole subject. Why? Bro. "S. A." answers, Because they did not approve of its use,—in fact, condemned and prohibited the practice. Is this the only possible answer that can be given to this question? It will not do to say it is the *most probable*,—it must be the *only*, the *necessary* answer, or the argument is not a demonstration.

Suppose some one, a little versed in Hebrew antiquities, and, like brother "S. A.," ingenious in finding out explanations for the apostles' silence, should say, that the use of music in the public worship among the Jews was confined to the Temple worship,—a special arrangement, originally introduced by David (1 Chron. 25: 1–7) for conducting the praise of the Temple,—and that, as the first Christian congregations were formed, in their organization and order, not after the model of the Temple, but after the model of the Synagogue, in which instrumental music was *not* used, where there were no courses of Levites organized into choirs, and that this was the reason why the apostles had no occasion to speak of instrumental music in the Christian worship,—would not even brother "S. A." be constrained to say that this is a *third* "possible way in which his argument may be *evaded?*" To run the parallel a little further,—suppose it were argued that if the *neglect* of the apostolic churches to introduce instrumental music into their worship is to be taken as proof that it was wrong to do so,—as in fact both "restrictive and prohibiitive" of the practice,—must not the fact that the Jewish Synagogues, which were

Digitized by Google

older in their organization than the origin of the Temple choirs, in like manner neglected to introduce instrumental music into their worship, be also taken as proof that it was wrong to do so, and as in fact both "restrictive and prohibitive" of the practice? But this proves too much; for it will not be contended that instrumental music would have been *wrong*, and offensive to God and the worshiping Jew in the Synagogue, while it was *right*, and acceptable to both, in the Temple. It is conceded that a Jew could praise God on an instrument, of *even ten strings*, anywhere, without sin, so far as the instrument was concerned.

Brother 'S. A.' has given *one* explanation of the silence of the apostles concerning instrumental music in their worship,—I have given another, more in harmony, I think, with the facts in the case; and it is a rule of logic, that where two causes may be assigned, either of which will account for a fact, we cannot affirm, absolutely, either of them. It becomes a question of probable inference. Perhaps, if there were any necessity for doing so, I might give yet other solutions of this *silence* of the apostles, quite as probable as that of brother 'S. A.;' but I proceed rather to another view of his argument.

At the most, this argument is no more than a presumption;—let us concede that it is a *strong* presumption, yet, as an argument, it is no more. Now it is always legitimate to meet one presumption by another, and suppose it were answered, Since instrumental music was in the days of the apostles "used everywhere; in the temple, in the camp, on both festive and funeral occasions, and in the domestic circle both among Jews and Heathen; and together with singing was cultivated as an art by all nations and all people;" and moreover, that "some of the leading men of the church had been connected with the musical department of the Temple service, as Barnabas, who was a Levite, the tribe consecrated of God to play on musical instruments, besides a great company of priests," &c., it is natural to conclude that in the beginning, the uninstructed music-loving and musically educated would seek to introduce instrumental music into the worship of the churches. This would be nothing more than natural, and is in fact involved in the argument of brother 'S. A.' But if this had been done, and the attempt had been offensive to the apostles, would they not have explicitly condemned it? Would not this strong passion for instrumental music have required the

Digitized by Google

most positive prohibition to repress it? Look at the parallel case of circumcision. Certain men, still under the influence of Judaism, taught the brethren, Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved. This called out Paul and Barnabas in remonstrance, and finally required a reference to the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. So also as to other questions—questions about eating and drinking, in respect of fast days, new moons, and Sabbaths. These grew out of the precedent customs of the times, and coming naturally enough into the church, called for explicit utterances on the part of the inspired teachers. Is there not a strong presumption, that a similar explicit declaration would have been required in the case of instrumental music, had the apostles felt it necessary to condemn or forbid its use? Of course, I am looking at the question simply as a presumption—and with the facts concerning the prevalence of instrumental music as brother 'S. A.' states them, it cannot be denied that the presumption is a strong one, that the instruments would have claimed to be heard, and thus have compelled a reproof from the apostles, if indeed they objected to their use. This, I say, would have been natural, *with the facts as brother 'S. A.' states them.* For my own part, I regard them very differently. The instrumental music to which the Jews were familiar in the Temple, was in no way suited to the spirit of Christianity. It could not have enlivened the sentiment of *Christian* praise, nor aided it in its musical expression. It could not do it now. Christian culture would be shocked now, as it would have been and doubtless was often shocked then, by the jarring monotony of such instruments and instrumental performers as they then had. Who, that has cultivated the melody of the heart, can tolerate a chorus of Pandean pipes—sackbuts, cymbals and horns! Christian culture has made a music of its own. The melody of the heart has subdued science to its service, and invented strains that express its deep and eternal longings for fellowship with the music of the heavens. Even if it could be proved to a demonstration that the apostles specifically condemned the instrumental music of the Temple, it could not be logically inferred that they equally condemned the music that has grown up under the inspiration of their own spiritual teaching.

But why am I thus at pains to show the quality and force of this ingenius argument of brother 'S A.'? In part because he

Digitized by Google

invites it, but mainly because I am constrained to judge this and every other attempt I have yet seen, to put the opposition to instrumental music in the church worship upon any other ground than that of *Christian*, let me say *scriptural, expediency*, illogical, unscriptural, and calculated in the end to lead to a dogmatism, which will disturb the peace and interrupt the fellowship of some of the children of God. If instrumental music in connection with our church praise is wrong, it is simply because it is practically injurious, and this is a sufficient ground to elicit the earnest and affectionate remonstrance of our public teachers against its introduction. Every one feels that it is not enough to say of a thing that the apostles are silent about it, or that they did not use it. This can be said of many things, of which no one complains. It must be shown that there is something in the nature of the thing, or in the practical influence of its use, which is incompatible with the word of God, or in some way injurious to our spiritual life and growth, before we can justly condemn it.—"Prove all things," says Paul, "hold fast that which is good." Let us "beware lest any one make a prey of us through an empty and deceitful philosophy, according to the traditions of man, according to the elements of the world, and not according to Christ. For all the fullness of the Deity resides substantially in him. And we are complete in him, who is the head of all government and power. By whom, also, we have been circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in immersion, by which also we have been raised with him, through the belief of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead. For he has forgiven us all our trespasses; having blotted out the hand-writing of the ordinances concerning us, which was contrary to us, he has taken it away, nailing it to the cross;—having spoiled governments and powers, he made a show of them openly, having triumphed over them by it. Let no one, therefore, judge us in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a festival, or of a new moon, or of sabbaths." And above all, brethren beloved, let not an organ be erected into a standard of fellowship among us, and usurp the place of Christ, who alone is our head. The Scripture has not yet been found, that makes the use of an instrument of music in the praise of God, a bar to the fellowship of the saints.

W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

LETTER OF FATHER HYACINTHE ON THE DOGMA OF INFALLIBILITY.

Father Hyacinthe, the brave Superior of the barefooted Carmelites of Paris, has remained perfectly consistent with himself in his protest against the insane pretensions of the Pope and his minions, the ultramontanes. The American bishops, who before the final decision of the council in favor of infallibility respectfully protested, after the decision have loyally submitted; and it is an exhibition of the most unmanly, pitiful, shameless tergiversation, to read archbishop Purcell's *explanation* of this bowing of the neck,—the conviction and the conscience, to what he, as writer of the protest, with others, who signed it, believed to be false—a belief which he frequently so openly and so fully expressed, as in his debate with Alexander Campbell. This is very much as we expected. Still we are by no means certain that these protesters, now so loyally declaring their adhesion to the new dogma, are at all *convinced*. From the tenor of the archbishop's public explanatory speech at Cincinnati, we are much inclined to doubt that. It is so exceedingly shallow and almost silly in its sophistries,—almost a piece of transparent Irish joking,—that we are almost forbidden to take the story with the conclusions in good earnest. These protesting but now yielding bishops will say *credo* with the mouth, while the heart says *non credo*

In Europe we have nobler, freer specimens of men. The brave, enlightened, *free* German *protestant* Catholic theologians, who so boldly denounced this Council, abide unshaken in their position to this hour. They have publicly declared they do not even now believe the dogma, and do not accept the decision of this servile council. Father Hyacinthe, in the following letter, which was published in the *Liberte* of Paris, and which we translate for the *Harbinger*, protests as boldly as ever against this outrageous, mad, new assumption of the Pope. And we are no longer in the middle ages. Neither the moral nor the physical power of the Pope can now compel submission; the latter is entirely gone, the former but a shadow of what it once was. Even the Catholic world is no longer his trembling slave. Hyacinthe's letter is a fair expression of the feelings of enlightened Catholics on the question of this Council and its acts. He says:

Digitized by Google

"From this day a grave question is proposed to Catholics:—must they adhere to the definition of the infallibility of the Pope, or are they free to refuse their submission? Without doubt, authority is the proper character of our church and the principle which governs our faith; but it is for this very reason that it is important for us to distinguish between an apparent and a real authority, between a blind submission and one that is reasonable and given on reflection—*Rationabile obsequium vestrum*, 'your *reasonable* service.' (Paul—Rom. 12: 1.)

"The question can then be stated thus: Is the authority of the Vatican council legitimate? or, in other words, does it possess the essential characteristics of an ecumenical council?

"The first of these characteristics is *liberty*. But, in spite of the secrecy with which it has been sought to cover the interior work of the Council, as if it had been one of those works of which the New Testament speaks, which have a natural affinity with darkness, and which shun the light for fear of being judged, —*ut non arguantur opera ejus*,* "that their deeds may not be made manifest,"—light has nevertheless risen on the deeds of the council, and will yet become still clearer.

"The repeated protestations of so many illustrious bishops are well known, men representing the most considerable and the most enlightened portions of the Catholic world, and that quite recent letter, at the same time so respectful and yet so firm, in which, in maintaining and defending their negative vote, they have given their motives for retreating from this dishonorable battle-field. The world cannot forget or overlook with what absence of dignity, I might say even of seriousness, the great interests of the faith have been treated by a majority, whose factitious composition and audacious oppressions would never have been tolerated in the ancient councils.

"Another condition, not less important, of the ecumenicity of a council, is, that it should be recognized by the church. The council, in fact, has not as its mission the task of imposing on the faithful new articles of faith, but to maintain, and, if it is necessary, to define and fix more clearly the ancient articles of faith. The bishops are, before all others, the witnesses of the

* Catholic writers usually quote the Scriptures in Latin, from the *Vulgate*. C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

traditional and historic faith of their respective churches and of the universal church; and their decision as judges, limited beforehand by the nature of the testimony, can be brought to bear only on such truths as have been believed from the beginning, everywhere and always, as revealed:—*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.* If, then, it should happen that they have transgressed their powers, the church would not recognize its faith in the arbitrary work they have accomplished, and the council would remain without authority.

"Such crises are not without examples, and to cite only a single one, history has recorded the names of Seleucia and Rimini, and that almost universal defection; or, to use the language of St. Jerome, 'the world groaned and was amazed to find itself Arian.' *

"The peril is not less at the present hour, and if we are to believe one of the most eminent prelates of the Council, archbishop Kenrick, the church has never known a greater peril. At such moments, it is the duty of the humblest of Christians to lift up the voice in defense of the faith, and of the faith of all. As for myself, I feel myself moved in my inmost soul to fulfill this duty, and, as the prophet has said, 'to deliver my soul,'—*tu autem animam tuam liberasti.*

"I protest then against the pretended dogma of the infallibility of the Pope, such as is contained in the decree of the Council of Rome. It is because I am a Catholic and wish to remain so, that I refuse to admit, as binding on the faith of all, a doctrine unknown to the antiquity of the church, contested even to-day by many and eminent theolgians, and which implies not a regular

* These two councils were assembled about the same time, (in the year 359) for convenience one in the East, at Seleucia in Isauria, the other at Ariminum, or Rimini, in Italy, by the Emperor Constantine, in the interest of a dominant Arian and Semi-Arian feeling—which the Emperor shared—in the East. At Rimini, 400 bishops assembled, of whom only 80 were Arians. After much resistance on the part of the orthodox, who clung to the Nicean symbols of faith, finally, through the Emperor's controlling influence, all the bishops, except 20, subscribed the Arian formula; and of these 20 several were afterwards gained over. At Seleucia, 160 bishops assembled,—105 Semi-Arians, 80 Strict Arians and about 10 orthodox. This Council finally subscribed the same formula which had been forced on that of Rimini, and not even the Semi-Arians, but the ultra Arians carried off the victory, by an infinite amount of maneuvering and skillful tactics. C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

development, but a radical change in the constitution of the church and in the immutable law of its faith.

"It is because I am a Christian and wish to remain so, that I rise up with all my soul against these honors, almost divine, decreed to a man who is presented to our faith, I was going to say to our worship, as uniting in his person both the dominion which is repugnant to the spirit of the gospel whose minister he is, and the infallibility which is repugnant to his being formed of the same clay with ourselves. One of the most illustrious of the predecessors of Pius IX, St. Gregory the Great, rejected, as a sign of Antichrist, the title of *universal bishop*, which had been offered to him; what would he have said of the title of *infallible pontiff?*

"On the 27th of September of last year, I wrote the following lines on the subject of the council, then about to assemble:

"'If the fears, which I do not wish to share, will be realized; if the august assembly has not more liberty in its deliberations than it has already had in its preparation; if, in a word, it is deprived of the characteristics essential to an ecumenical council,—I shall cry to God and men to demand of them another, truly assembled in the Holy Spirit, not in the spirit of parties, representing really the universal church,—not the silence of the one and the opposition of the others.'

"This cry to-day I send forth. I appeal to a council truly free and ecumenical.

"And, above all, to-day, as before, I lift up my voice to God. Men have been powerless to make truth and righteousness triumph:—then may God arise to take in hand his cause and judge it! The council which ought to have been a work of light and of peace, has increased the darkness and unchained discord in the religious world. War has answered to it like a terrible echo in the social world.

"War is the scourge of God; but in bringing upon us the chastisement, may it not also bring us the remedy? In sweeping away the old edifice, may it not also prepare the ground on which the husband of the church will construct the New Jerusalem?

BROTHER HYACINTHE.

"PARIS, July 30th."

No one can fail to recognize in this letter, as in all his words, a free, noble and generous soul. Though yet in the bonds of the

Digitized by Google

Catholic faith, he has tasted and learned the sweetness and holiness and greatness of liberty, such as the gospel brings; and there are many in the bosom of that church like-minded with him. From an Augustine convent the reformation of the sixteenth century came forth; may there not yet come forth from Carmelite convents, and other homes in the Catholic church, souls touched with the spark of evangelical life and light and freedom, to be fully redeemed by the truth as it is in Christ Jesus? Who knows what in these wonderful times may yet come to pass, in the marvelous ways of God, to the glory of his holy name?

The prophetic words in the last paragraph of this letter may yet find some strange fulfillment; if not immediate, the great events now unexpectedly transpiring, may be but its sure beginning. C. L. L.

BAPTISTS AMONG THE FREEDMEN.

There is to-day no more evident great duty of Christians in this country, none for which more earnest and immediate effort and freer sacrifices should be made, than the gospel mission among the colored population late in slavery in the South. What our own people are doing, we confess we do not know;—if any thing noteworthy and systematic were done, we doubt not we should know of it. We have no heart to say anything further, at this hour, on this great question of a mission on a generous scale, commensurate with the field and our actual abilities, among the freedmen. We look with joy and sadness at statements such as we give below,—joy at what others like the Baptists are doing, sadness at our own marvelous remissness in doing anything proportionably comparable to this. But enough! we cannot add a word. C. L. L.

BAPTIST WORK AMONG THE FREEDMEN.—The *Watchman and Reflector*, in an article on this subject, says:

"Our work at the South means, mainly, the work among the freedmen; for, at present, our co-operation is not desired in other matters.

"What is the work to be done? It is to 'open the Book and to loose the seals thereof' to millions, many of whom, called to

Digitized by Google

the ministry of the Word, now 'weep much' because unable to read that Book.

"What has been done? Enough to encourage all round, and to stimulate to do more. In the first place, we have all come to see that God calls blacks as well as whites to the ministry, and that He calls them in all their ignorance, throwing on others the responsibility of properly training them to their work; and to see further, while we must not wholly neglect to educate the masses, and while, in fact, our missionary preachers and teachers have, the last year, taught nearly four thousand pupils in week-day schools, that our present chief work among the freedmen is to educate the colored preachers. Hence, we have established Wayland Seminary, in Washington, D. C.; Colver Institute, in Richmond, Va.; Shaw Collegiate Institute, in Raleigh, N. C.; Augusta Institute, Augusta, Ga.; Leland University, New Orleans, La.; and a Normal and Theological Institution, in Nashville, Tenn.

"In the second place, we have started right in this thing, seeing before us not the work of a day, but the foundations of many generations to be laid; suitable and ample grounds to be purchased; substantial buildings to be erected; endowments to be raised; scholarships to be founded; and libraries, and apparatus, and all other needful helps to be furnished. In the third place, purses have been opening more and more to meet the demands made by enlarged views. Year before last we raised only $5,000 for this work; last year nearly $38,000 in cash and more than $60,000 in pledges, or over $100,000 in all. A single New England Baptist gave $13,000; another $5,000, beside $50,000 by will, to be paid at his death; another $10,000, and another, from Georgia, $2,000; another, from Illinois, $1,000, and others from all sections, donations larger and smaller, but all with a cheerfulness and a heartiness which are a most cheering omen for the future.

"What are our plans now? First, to found and endow one first-class training school for preachers and teachers in each Southern State; second, to raise a permanent fund of half a million of dollars for this purpose; and third, to employ all proper means to attach the colored people to these schools as rapidly as possible, so that they shall feel them to be theirs, contribute to their support, assist in their management, and send to them their pious youth and adults who desire to preach or teach.

"May God give to all our people a mind to work at this great enterprise in earnest prayer and liberal alms!"

Digitized by Google

TERMS EMPLOYED FOR BAPTISM IN THE ANCIENT VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

[A beloved brother sends us from across the waters a learned treatise on the mode and subjects of Baptism, by "J. B. Lindsay, author of the Lord's prayer in fifty languages, and of the Chrono-Astrolabe." Our readers will be gratified with the following candid examination of the terms employed for Baptism in the ancient versions of the New Testament. Endeavors like this are an overwhelming proof of the unity of conviction and practice on this subject of the entire Christian world for many centuries after the first planting of Christianity by the apostles. —W. K. P.]

1. The first version seems to have been the Syriac, about the end of the first or beginning of the second century. The words for baptize, baptism, and baptist, are *amad* and its derivatives. Now the word *amad* signifies in Hebrew to *stand*, and some advocates of sprinkling regard such a posture as a proof against *immersion*. Such advocates seem entirely ignorant of the Syriac language, as the word *in it* never signifies to *stand*. The same occurs in Arabic *amad*, which signifies to *bear up* or *support*, and also to *baptize*, but never to *stand*. Michaelis, in his notes to Castel's Syriac Lexicon, says that the word does not seem to him to have any connection with the Hebrew, but he thinks it to be the same word with the Arabic *ghamat*—to immerse. Before seeing this statement I supposed it to be the same word with the Arabic *ghamas*, which also signifies to immerse. Now *ghamas* is evidently the same word as the Coptic *oms*, which in Psalm lv. 9 means to *submerse*, and in the New Testament uniformly to *baptize*. In the Psalm alluded to the Septuagint has καταποντιζω—to *submerse*, and the Hebrew bala—*swallow up*, but in our version is rendered *destroy*.

2. The next version, after the Syriac, seems to have been the Coptic or Egyptian, made in the second or third century. Large portions of the Bible are extant in the three dialects—Coptic, Sahidic, and Bashmuric. The word for baptism in this language is *oms*, which signifies to immerse, as already stated.

3. The next version appears to be the Ethiopic. The word for baptism in it is *tamaka*, which also means to *immerse* in general. There is a cognate word *tama* which also signifies both to *immerse* and to *tinge*, but is never applied to baptism. The Ethiopians

Digitized by Google

have always baptized by immersion, and do so at the present day, but they baptize infants.

4. There were doubtless early versions of the New Testament into Arabic, but no fragments of these have yet been found. Spurious Gospels, such as that of the Infancy and of Nicodemus, seem to have been abundantly spread in that country, and Mohammed has made copious quotations from them in the Koran. The word for baptism in Arabic was evidently *sabagh*, being the same as the Chaldee *tsaba*, which we have already seen denotes to *immerse*, or *dip*. It is found twice in the Koran, chapter ii., verse 132 (in other copies 139)—the *baptism* of God we receive, and who is better than God as to *baptism?* The same word also occurs in chap. xxxiii. 20 (or 21) in the sense of *syrup, juice*, or *sap*—"We raise to you a tree which springs from Mt. Sinai, and produces oil and juice (sabagh) for those who eat." The Arabic word most commonly employed now for baptism is *amad*, being the same as the Syriac.

5. The Christian religion was introduced into Armenia in the third century, chiefly by the influence of Gregory and of the King Tiridates. In the fourth century the Bible was translated by Mesrob, and his translation is in use to the present day. To baptize is *mekrtel* in this language, and Aucher in his Armenian dictionary explains the word thus—"*Mekrtel*—to baptize, to wash by plunging into water." Infants are baptized by the Armenians, but the mode of baptism has always been by immersion.

6. There is no doubt that early Latin versions were made both of the Old and New Testament, and many fragments of these are extant. The versions of Jerome, however, in a great measure, superseded previous ones. Jerome translated the Old Testament from the Hexaplar text of Origen, and the New Testament from the Greek about A. D. 391. A little after this time, he translated the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew, and this, under the name of the Vulgate, has been sanctioned by the Church of Rome. Jerome retains the Greek word for baptism in his Latin version, but in the ancient Latin writings we frequently find the words translated. *Tingo*—to baptize; *tinctio*—baptism; and *tinctor*—baptist, are common terms. Now, in the classic writers the word *tingo*, referring to water, means always to immerse, but, like the Greek *bapto*, it also signifies to tinge; the context, however, will indicate whether immersion or tinging is denoted.

Digitized by Google

7. Christianity seems to have been, in the second or third century, made known to the Goths, then inhabiting the banks of the Danube. The Bible was translated into Gothic, by Ulfilas, about 360. Only fragments of this version are known to be extant, but the four gospels and several epistles are nearly entire. Ulfilas sometimes employs *daupjan*, and at other times its compound *ufdaupjan*, as equivalent to the Greek word *baptizo*, and they are used indiscriminately even in the same verse. Thus in Luke iii. 21 we find—"Warth than bi the daupida alla manageia jah at Jesu updaupidamma"—"It was then when he (John) baptized all the people, Jesus also was baptized." The very same word also denotes to *dip*, as in John xiii. 26—"Andhof Jesus sa ist, thammei ik *ufdaupjands* thana hlaif giba, jah *ufdaupjands* thana hlaif, gaf Juden Seimonis Skariotan,'—"Jesus answered, it is he to whom I, *dipping* the bread, will give it, and, *dipping* the bread, he gave it to Judas Iscariot (son) of Simon." The noun *daupeins* is employed for baptism in Luke iii. 3: "Merjands daupein idreigos du fraleta frawaurhte"—"Preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." The same word is used for dipping or immersion in Mark vii. 4: "Daupeinins stikle jah aurkje"—"The immersions of cups and pots;" and in the 8th verse: "Daupeinins aurkje jah stikle"—"The immersions of pots and cups." More examples might be adduced, but let these suffice. It may be here observed that the Gothic *daupjan* is the origin of our word to *dip*.

8. The Germans were doubtless made acquainted with Christianity in the fourth or fifth century. The term to baptize has always been in German *taufen*, being the same with the Gothic *daupjan* and English *dip* and *dive*. This word has latterly been confined to baptism in the same way as the Armenian word *mekrtel*, and other words are now employed in both these languages for immersion or dipping in ordinary cases. The Germans employ *tauchen*, *eintauchen*, *untertauchen*, *versenken*, &c., instead of taufen and its compounds, but I do not think that *taufen* = to *dip*, has yet become obsolete in ordinary cases.

9. In Dutch, to baptize is *doopen;* in Danish, *dobe;* and in Swedish, *dopa*—mere varieties of the Gothic daupjan, the German taufen, and the English dip or dive. In these languages a slight change is made on the word for dipping or immersion in ordinary cases. The Swedes then use *doppe*, the Danes *dyppe*, and the

Digitized by Google

Dutch *dompelen;* but in the Dutch New Testament the word doopen is used to dip as well as baptize.

10. As the Icelandic language is akin to the Danish and Swedish, we might have been led to think that *dyfa*, to dip, would have been applied to baptism. Whether it was ever so employed I am at present uncertain, but the Bible was not translated for them till sprinkling had become common, and the word *skira*, to *scour* or *wash*, has been used in it.

11. The Saxons, when they invaded Britain, did not profess Christianity, and it was some time before they adopted it. Adhelm, first bishop of Sherburn, translated the Psalms into Saxon about A. D. 706. Soon after, the four gospels were translated by Egbert or Eadfrid, bishop of Holy Island. Bede, who died in A. D. 735, translated the whole Bible. At that time sprinkling had not been introduced, and we should expect the terms for baptism to denote immersion. To dip is *dyppan*, but I am not sure that this word is ever applied to baptism. The term commonly employed is *fullian*—to full, wash, whiten; and *fullere* is fuller, washer, bleacher. *Fullwiht* or *fullught* is baptism, and *fulluhtere* or *fullwihtere* is baptist. These terms sufficiently show that *immersion* is intended, and they have no relation whatever to *sprinkling*.

12. The Slavonic tribes seem not to have been early acquainted with Christianity. Cyril and Methodius, two brothers, were the first that formed a Slavonic alphabet, and translated the Bible in whole or in part into the Slavonic tongue. This was about A. D. 863, at which time the eastern and western Churches were united, and the alphabet of Cyril was one of the chief causes of their subsequent disruption. Baptism by immersion was then universal, the Greek Church perform it in this manner still, but the Roman Church began to sprinkle about A. D. 1300. Even before this time, invalid children were occasionally sprinkled, but sprinkling was not general for centuries after it. The Slavonic nations and languages chiefly comprise the Russians, Poles, Bohemians, and Servians. The custom of marking persons baptized with the sign of the cross was then general. The cross in Russian is *krest*, in Polish *krzyz*, and in Bohemian *kriz*. To mark with the cross, and also to baptize, is in Russian *krestit*, in Polish *chrzcic*, and in Bohemian *krtiti*, or its compounds *pokrtiti* and *okrtiti*.

13. The Hungarian terms for *cross* and *baptize* are similarly con-

Digitized by Google

nected. The cross is *kereszt*, and to baptize is *keresztelni*. In Finnish the cross is *risti;* and to make the sign of the cross, and also to baptize, is *ristin*. In Finnish also, *kristi* is a *Christian*, and *kristitsen* is to make a Christian, to *baptize*, or as we say *christen*. In the other languages of Europe the word is a variation of the Greek.

14. It would be interesting to know what terms were used for baptism by early missionaries in the various countries of Asia; ut such a desire is little likely to be gratified. Some information, however, can be obtained from an inscription found in Sigan-fu, a city of China. This inscription, written on stone, was found in A. D. 1625, and has been deciphered by Europeans. It records the doctrine and labors of Nestorian missionaries in China, and the date on the stone is A. D. 782. Many corruptions from apostolic simplicity had then taken place, both in the eastern and western churches, and the Nestorians had their share in these corruptions. The part of the inscription referring to baptism is not far from the beginning, and is as follows: Ting-wu shing chin, king liu nien tseih pu, ching yuen hwa i fa ling, pien fa *yuh* shuei fung, *teih fau* hwa ul kie heu pih, yin chi shih tszi, jung szi cha i ho wu keu, keih muh chin jin huei chi yin, tung li tseu sang yung chi lu—"At mid-day, ascends the truth; the scriptures remaining are 27 books; for propagation, the originals are translated to excite (men's) minds; the entering ordinance is the *bathing* rite; *washing* and *floating* (or emerging) to adorn and wash the interior white; for a seal they take the sign of the cross; pointing in the four directions, to assemble without delay; beating the drum, the sound of excitement, benevolence and mercy: the rites made toward the east, point out the road of the glory of the living." The language used here plainly points out that immersion was the practice of these Nestorians. In the modern Protestant versions, *yuh*, to bathe, is not employed, but *si*, to wash; the same word is used by Roman Catholics. The Chinese themselves have a kind of baptism or religious washing which they call *fuh*.

16. The Baptist missionaries in India employed in their translations a word denoting to immerse, but these translations were not adopted by the Bible Society. In the Bengali, Hindustani, and almost all other languages of India and the South Sea, the Greek word is used. Sometimes a word denoting to *wash* is employed, but I have never seen applied to it a word denoting to *sprinkle*.

Digitized by Google

TOTAL DEPRAVITY.

A. W. WALTHALL AND DR. PETRI.

The Baptists—let us rather say, *some* of their preachers in the west, and especially in Kentucky—are attempting to find great fault with us, in fact insurmountable obstacles to union with us,—among other things, especially because we do not *think* with them on the subject of "total depravity." Of this class is Mr. E. Petri. Sometime in the past spring, he preached "A sermon" at the Baptist church in Franklin, Ky., the object of which was to show "some reasons why he could not unite with the Campbellites upon the Bible;" and first among these was our heresy on this venerated Augustinian dogma of total depravity. Mr. Petri calls it "the fundamental truth taught in the Bible"—"the foundation of the structure of salvation." The "Sermon" has been very effectively reviewed by brother Walthall, and we thank him for a copy. We take the liberty of reproducing so much of it as replies to this fundamental objection of Mr. Petri, which is thus courteously stated: "Because, says Mr. P., they (the Campbellites) sap the very foundation of the structure of salvation by denying the fundamental truth taught in the Bible, i. e., total depravity." To this brother Walthall replying, says:

"'Nothing,' says Mr. Petri, 'is more common and at the same time more dishonest, than to misrepresent the doctrines which cannot be successfully opposed. Concerning this doctrine, it is a common thing with Campbellites to misrepresent it.'

"Logically, then, nothing can be more dishonest than the conduct of Campbellites. But let us look for a moment at reason.

"No. 1. It declares that Total Depravity is the very foundation of the structure of salvation. Now, suppose upon inquiry, it should appear that the Bible does not teach it, would the structure of salvation fall to pieces? Could not God save man, though he be not totally, but only partially depraved? The line of Mr. Petri's argument puts him in the negative. Total depravity is the very foundation of the structure. Remove the foundation, and the structure falls. Total depravity, then, is *essential* to salvation!! If man is only *partially* depraved, the structure based upon *total* depravity can not meet his case. A limb totally gan-

Digitized by Google

grened and putrescent must be amputated, but if only partially diseased, it may, by appropriate remedies, be restored to soundness. Mr. Petri quotes many texts of Scripture which prove human depravity, but not one which proves its totality. The issue is not on depravity, but on totality.

"Now, we are glad to find, that though Mr. Petri will not *formally* abandon the word *total*, yet in his argument he does *virtually* give it up. He denies that total depravity excludes all 'moral good in man,' or 'unfits the sinner for any good thought or action.' Then it cannot be *total*. Hence, if Mr. Petri would no longer strive about words to no profit, let him drop this bone of contention, and place himself in harmony with Bible teaching—let him say with us, that while the human family is a fallen race, yet no child of Adam is, at birth, totally depraved; else the Savior was mistaken when, of the little children before him, he said to those about him: 'Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.' God had, long before, by the mouth of Ezekiel, condemned as *false* the proverb: 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth have been set on edge,' adding as the *true* principle, 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' The little child, not having yet sinned, is the model of the pardoned adult—both *guiltless* now—both liable to become *guilty* hereafter.

Now if there is in the universe a being totally depraved, it is Satan, seated upon the throne of Agony, wielding with fiendish delight, the burning scepter of remorse over the regions of the damned. By constant association with Satan man may ultimately become fully assimilated to his character, provided Satan has ceased to make progress in spiritual wickedness. But if there is eternal progress in sin, then the Devil himself is but an approximation towards the point of ultimate totality. The single text, 'We love him because he first loved us,' upsets all the learned philosophy in behalf of total depravity. It proves there is in man, though fallen, a redeeming element, namely, the principle of gratitude, to which the love of God can appeal with a fair prospect of success. Hence the gospel makes the appeal and finds the response.

"Now, if Mr. Petri means by total depravity no more than that fallen man is utterly unable to devise and execute a plan of salvation for himself, as were the Israelites, when hemmed in by

Digitized by Google

impassible mountains on the right and on the left, the sea in front and Pharaoh's hosts in the rear, while Moses said, 'Stand still and see the salvation of the Lord, then we have no controversy with him here. But if he means that like inability exists on the part of man *after* the plan is developed, and the word to us is, as to them it was, *go forward*, then we take issue. We hold that as the Israelites were able to avail themselves of the salvation which God had provided for them through Moses, so the sinner is able to avail himself of the salvation which God has provided for him through the Messiah. The cases are precisely parallel. As no special aid was imparted to the Israelite to enable him to *go forward*, so none is needed on the part of the sinner to enable him to act. The doctrine of regeneration *before* faith, is a paralyzing heresy, dishonoring to God and ruinous to man. True, Messiah says: 'No man can come to me except the Father who sent me, draw him.' But, then, in the next verse, which Mr. Petri did not quote, he explains how the Father draws. 'They shall all be taught of God: every one therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.' Hence, so soon as one hears and learns he can come. And strange as it may seem, yet it is true, that our preacher cites this very text, minus the explanation, as clear proof of total depravity. He also cites a fragment of the text (Eph. ii. 3), 'and were by nature the children of wrath,' and argues thence, as if Paul taught in opposition to Christ, that the babe is, by birth, a child of wrath.

"But, to solve a difficulty which somebody had suggested, why the children of regenerated parents should be, like those of the unregenerate, totally depraved, Mr. Petri brings the following illustration: A man plants the seeds of a delicious apple; they come up and grow to maturity, but the fruit proves to be sour seedlings, unfit for use. It was found, on examination, that the tree which produced the luscious apple was grafted, and that 'the seed partook of the wild nature of the root and re-produced its kind. Thus the new nature of the Christian is grafted into his old nature; his offspring partakes of the nature of his origin.' If that be the law of reproduction, then all Adam's offspring should be holy; for his sinful nature is grafted on to his original holy nature, and hence his children would partake of the root and reproduce its holy kind, instead of a thievish race 'by nature,' as Mr. Petri affirms."

Digitized by Google

This is pointed and practical. Brother Walthall is a sharp analyst, and will help Mr. Petri to understand himself better than he seems to have done when he wrote the sermon. His answers to the *four* other reasons which Mr. Petri assigns are equally clear and forcible. Perhaps if we could overcome these objections we might be admitted into the blessed fellowship of Mr. Petri, and that so delectable a probability may not escape us, we shall state them. We have given the *first.*

The *second* is:—"They (the Campbellites) pervert the Biblical order of things, by placing faith before repentance."

The *third:*—"I cannot unite with the Campbellites upon the Bible, Because they deny that the Spirit acts immediately upon the heart of the sinner, i. e., apart from the word."

The *fourth:*—"Because they teach baptismal salvation."

And the *fifth:*—Because they believe that a child of God may apostatize and finally be lost."

Brother Walthall has carefully and well reviewed this whole Sermon in a tract of 16 pages, which is for sale at the office of the Christian Advocate, at the very moderate price of 10 cts. for a single copy, or $1.00 per dozen. We commend it to all who are inquiring on these subjects. W. K. P.

A PLEA FOR UNION.

Bro. Pendleton:—I see that, thus far, Bro. Franklin, of the *Review,* is the only one who has answered your queries on "Sectarianism," propounded in the *Harbinger* some months since, and as the long delay of the *Standard* and *Times* suggests the probability of their not answering at all, will you not go on and give us your own views?

Bro. Franklin's article seems to be a very fair and frank exposition of the matters treated of, but I wish either that you had asked a little further, or that he had gone a little beyond the queries and told us also, whether he considered other denominations as "sects" or not, and his reasons for so thinking. The whole question has often occupied my thoughts, but I never could reach any conclusion satisfactory to my own mind, and as Bro. Franklin's article also fails to satisfy me entirely, I am the more anxious

Digitized by Google

to hear from you. What I desire *most*, is to have pointed out the difference between ourselves and others, that frees us from the charge of being "sectarian" and yet leaves them subject thereto. I have never regarded "sect" as an appropriate appellation for any body of believers in "Christ as the Son of God," rather esteeming it appropriate to those classes of religionists who deny the divinity of Christ, or accept other men as their leaders and instructors. Webster says "sect" means "a number of persons united in tenets but constituting a distinct party by holding sentiments different from those of other men." In all denominations who believe in the divinity of Christ, I supposed there was an *unity* of sentiment, the difference growing out of interpretations of Scripture, as to *practices*—and that, therefore, they could *not*, in any such sense of the word as the above, be "sects." But as brother Franklin is so much more conversant with the whole subject, I presume I must be in error. I presume we are *all* agreed that *our* church, or *our* people, meaning the same by *our* as does Bro. Franklin, are a part or portion of the "Church of Christ." I believe more than this (though I may be too liberal in so doing), that all other bodies of professing Christians, who accept Christ as the Savior and Redeemer, are also parts and portions of the "Church of Christ." But I am constrained to believe thus when I remember that "Christ's church" has existed and been in full and active operation since the day of Pentecost, and *consequently* long before *our* people were ever known or heard of. It must then have been made up of members of other bodies of Christians, existing at, and before the period of our reformation—and those same members, or succeeding members of the same bodies, must still, in part make up the membership of "Christ's church." Whether they were only the "penitent *immersed* believers," or all "penitent believers" that made up the membership, is for God alone to determine. We lay great stress on *immersion*, insisting that *nothing else* is *baptism*. With the *light* we have, neither "sprinkling" nor "pouring" is baptism to us; but ought we to judge as to their sufficiency to those who, knowing no better, *believe it to be?* Nothing is more plainly inculcated in the New Testament than the fact that honest "intention" and "desire" are as acceptable with God as the actual fulfillment or execution of the "intention" or "desire." For example, A "intends" to relieve a family of poor neighbors, and has already laid aside the money

Digitized by Google

for that purpose, but before he gets to them, finds that by some legacy, or other means, they are beyond want, and, consequently, the need of his assistance; or, a sinner hearing the word, believes and repents, and is to be baptized on the succeeding night, but is killed before that time; or, a poor widow sees some one in distress and desires earnestly to minister to that one's necessities but cannot get to her;—will not God, in all these cases, accept as readily the "intention and desire," and be fully as well pleased therewith, as if they had been carried out? Or suppose further that a man cherishes hatred for his brother with a desire to injure him, is he not quite as guilty in the sight of God as if he had actually injured him? We are all ready to acknowledge this, and can see the propriety of it, *until* we come to the question of *baptism.* We readily admit that God will *not* cut off that person who had believed, repented and *intended* to be *immersed,* but was prevented by death, but yet cannot believe that God will be equally merciful to the poor deluded man or woman who with equal earnestness and honesty o purpose has been "sprinkled," believing it *to be* the very thing required at their hands. Why shall it *not* be accounted to them as "*baptism,*" so long as in the use and exercise of the talents bestowed upon them, they conscientiously believe it *to be baptism?* They and all such will be judged by the *light they had,* and not by the light wherein *we* stand.

God's glorious Truth has long been enshrouded in the folds of Roman superstition and darkness of the middle ages, and the process of its unfolding and full recovery has been step by step, little by little, and a slow and long process. Let us thank God that we are the happy possessors of its latest scintillations, and remember that the eyes of our denominational brethren have been so long in darkness that it will take some time to accustom them to the light. That they have not already recognized it, may be as much or more our fault than theirs, in that we have abused and ridiculed their errors until their anger has been aroused, and their vision blinded by passion. If, instead of this, we had tried to persuade them in a brotherly spirit, recognizing them as brethren in Christ, and working in harmony with them on the great many points of agreement between us, ignoring for the time the difference in our interpretations of God's commands, they would in time *themselves* have seen their errors and corrected them. That great and good man, Alexander Campbell, in his de-

Digitized by Google

bate with Mr. Rice, said substantially: "I would rather take by the hand and call *brother*, that man whose conduct proved him to be a follower of Christ, though he differed with me in doctrinal points, than him who agreed with me entirely in the last, but failed in the former." I remember well the utterance. It was *Christ-like*, and worthy of being uttered by one in whom the Spirit of Christ dwelt so largely. May God enable us to acquire the same tolerant spirit—to lay aside all bigotry, partisan feelings, and prejudice, and predispose us to work in harmony with our Christian brethren of every denomination. Paul rejoiced that "Christ was preached," even when done through evil motives and to add affliction to his bonds. Surely then ought we to rejoice to have him preached by our fellow-brethren, when their motives are as pure and holy as our own, even though there are some differences between us.

I fear we do *not* rejoice as much as we should when we hear of conversions to Christ in other denominations—and yet we should do so, without one shade of envy or regret that they did not join our own body. As to our differences, they are on minor points, whilst our *agreements* are in the great and distinguishing characteristics,—faith, repentance, baptism, Lord's supper, prayer, assembling ourselves together, and Christ-like conduct. We have no differences so *radical* as that between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians,—nothing more nor less than the rigid observance of the entire Jewish law by the one, whilst the other regarded it not. May not God have intended this, as also the already growing errors in the seven churches of Asia, as examples to keep the "uuity in the bond of peace," and to work together in harmony for the conversion of the world, without paying any attention to the matters in which we disagree? If *you* think so, then wield your powerful influence among our brethren to induce them to acknowledge *every one* who will confess "Jesus as the Son of the living God," as a *Christian* and "brother" in full fellowship, without further *tests* or *requirements*, leaving each one to learn his duty from God's word, and to obey or disobey at his peril. We can never effect an union on the basis of so many conditions as we now present; for all *cannot* agree, and we have no more right to insist upon their giving up cherished convictions, than they have to insist on us giving up ours. But *there is* a foundation on which we can ALL stand with clear consciences, and no sacrifices

Digitized by Google

of beliefs or practices—and that is the foundation laid by Christ himself, to wit, that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God." Had we not better unite on this, than remain separated as we now are, powerless for good to the world? Urge it, write for it, and let us pray for it—and may God, in his mercy grant it. —Yours fraternally, L.

REAL DISTINCTIONS EFFACED IN THE COMMON VERSION.

[From Trench on Bible Revision, ch. v.]

One must always regret, and the regret has been often expressed, that in the Apocalypse our Translators should have rendered *therion* and *zoon* by the same word, 'beast.' Both play important parts in the book; both belong to its higher symbolism; but to portions the most different. The *zoa*, or "living creatures," which stand before the throne, in which dwells the fullness of all creaturely life, as it gives praise and glory to God (iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; v. 6; vi. 1; and often) form part of the *heavenly* symbolism; the *theria*, the first beast and the second, which rise up, one from the bottomless pit (xi. 7), the other from the sea (xiii. 1), of which the one makes war upon the two Witnesses, the other opens his mouth in blasphemies, these form part of the *hellish* symbolism. To confound these and those under a common designation, to call those 'beasts' and these 'beasts,' would be an oversight, even granting the name to be suitable to both; it is a more serious one, when the word used, bringing out, as this must, the predominance of the lower animal life, is applied to glorious creatures in the very court and presence of Heaven. The error is common to all the translations. That the Rheims should not have escaped it is strange; for the Vulgate renders *zoa* by 'animalia' ('animantia' would have been still better), and only *therion* by 'bestia.' If *zoa* had always been rendered "living creatures," this would have had the additional advantage of setting these symbols of the Apocalypse, even for the English reader, in an unmistakable connection with Ezek. i. 5, 13, 14, and often; where "living creature" is the rendering in our English Version of *chajah*, as *zoon* is in the Septuagint.

Digitized by Google

In like manner, in the parable of the Marriage of the King's Son (Matt. xxii. 1–14), the *douloi* who summon the bidden guests (ver. 3, 4), and the *diakonoi* who in the end expel the unworthy intruder (ver. 13), should not have been confounded under the common name of 'servants.' A real and important distinction between the several actors in the parable is in this way obliterated. The *douloi* are *men*, the ambassadors of Christ, those that invite their fellow-men to the blessings of the kingdom of heaven; but the *diakonoi* are *angels*, those that "stand by" (Luke xix. 24), ready to fulfill the Divine judgments, and whom we ever find the executors of these judgments in the day of Christ's appearing. They are as distinct from one another as the "servants of the householder," who in like manner are men, and the 'reapers,' who are angels, in the parable of the Tares (Matt. xiii. 27, 30). In the Vulgate the distinction which we have lost is preserved; the *douloi* are 'servi'; the *diakonoi* 'ministri;' and all our early translations in like manner rendered the words severally by 'servants' and 'ministers;' the Rheims by 'servants' and 'waiters.'

There is a very real distinction between *apistia* and *apeitheia*. It is often urged by our elder divines; I remember more than one passage in Jackson's works where it is so; but it is not constantly observed by our Translators. *Apistia* is, I believe, always and rightly rendered, 'unbelief,' while *apeitheia* is in most cases rendered, and rightly, 'disobedience;' but on two occasions (Heb. iv. 5, 11) it is also translated 'unbelief.' In like manner, *apistein* is properly "to refuse *belief*," *apeithein* "to refuse "*obedience*;" but *apeithein* is often in our translation allowed to run into the sense of *apistein*, as at John iii. 36; Acts xiv. 14. 2; xix. 9; Rom. xi. 30 (the right translation in the margin); and yet, as I have said, the distinction is real; *apeitheia* or disobedience is the consequence of *apistia* or unbelief; they are not identical with one another.

The standing word which St. Paul uses to express the forgiveness of sins is *aphesis amartion;* but on one remarkable occasion he changes his word, and instead of *aphesis* employs *paresis* (Rom. iii. 25). Our Translators take no note of the very noticeable substitution, but render *paresin amartion*, or rather *amartematon*, "*remission* of sins," as everywhere else they have rendered the more usual phrase. But it was not for nothing that St. Paul used here quite another word. He is speaking of quite a different

Digitized by Google

thing; he is speaking, not of the 'remission' of sins, or the letting of them quite go, but of the 'pretermission' (*paresis* from *pariemi*), the passing of them by on the part of God for awhile, the temporary dissimulation on his part, which found place under the Old Covenant, in consideration of the sacrifice which was one day to be. The passage is further obscured by the fact that our translators have rendered *dia ten paresin* as though it had been *dia tes pareseos*—"*for* the remission," that is, with a view to the remission, while the proper rendering of *dia*, with an accusative, would, of course, have been "because of the remission," or rather "the pretermission," or, as Hammond proposes, "because of the passing by, of past sins." What the Apostle would say is this: "There needed a signal manifestation of the righteousness of God on account of the long pretermission, or passing by, of sins in his infinite forbearance, with no adequate expression of his righteous wrath against them, during all those ages which preceded the revelation of Christ; which manifestation of his righteousness at length found place, when He set forth no other and no less than his own son to be the propitiatory sacrifice for sin." But the passage, as we have it now, cannot be said to yield this meaning.

Again, our translators obliterate, for the most part, the distinction between *pais Theou* and *uios Theou*, as applied to Christ. There are five passages in the New Testament in which the title *pais Theou* is given to the Son of God. In the first of these (Matt. xii. 18) they have rendered *pais* by 'servant;' and they would have done well if they had abode by this in the other four. These all occur in the Acts, and in every one of them the notion of 'servant' is abandoned, and 'son' (Acts iii. 13, 26) or 'child' (Acts iv. 27, 30), introduced. I am persuaded that in this they were in error. *Pais Theou* might be rendered 'servant of God,' and I am persuaded that it ought. It might be, for it needs not to say *pais* is continually used like the Latin 'puer' in the sense of servant, and in the LXX. *pais Theou* as the "servant of God." David calls himself so no less than seven times in 2 Sam. vii.; cf. Luke i. 69; Acts iv. 25; Job, i. 8; Ps. xix. 12, 14. But not merely might it have been thus rendered; it also should have been, as these reasons convince me: Every student of prophecy must have noticed how much there is of Isaiah prophesying of Christ under the aspect of "the *servant* of the Lord;" "Israel my servant;"

Digitized by Google

my servant whom I uphold" (Isai. xlii. 1–7; xlix. 1–12; lii. 13; liii. 12). I say, prophesying of Christ; for I dismiss, as a baseless dream of those who *a priori* are determined that there are, and therefore shall be, no prophecies in Scripture, the notion that the "servant of Jehovah" in Isaiah is Israel according to the flesh, or Isaiah himself, or the body of the prophets collectively considered, or any other except Christ himself. But it is quite certain, from the inner harmonies of the Old Testament and the New, that wherever there is a large group of prophecies in the Old, there is some allusion to them in the New. Unless, however, we render *pais Theou* by "servant of God in the place where that phrase occurs in the New, there will be no allusion throughout it all to that group of prophecies which designate the Messiah as the servant of Jehovah, who learned obedience by the things which He suffered. I can not doubt, and, as far as I know, this is the conclusion of all who have considered the subject, that *pais Theou* should be rendered "servant of God," as often as in the New Testament it is used of Christ. His *sonship* will remain sufficiently declared in innumerable other passages.

Something of precision and beauty is lost at John x. 16, by rendering *aule* and *poimne* by 'fold:' "And other sheep I have which are not of this *fold (aules)*; these also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one *fold (poimne)*, and one shepherd." It is remarkable that in the Vulgate there is the same obliteration of the distinction between the two words, 'ovile' standing for both. Substitute 'flock' for 'fold' on the second occasion of its occurring (this was Tyndale's rendering, which we should not have forsaken), and it will be at once felt how much the verse will gain. The Jew and the Gentile are the two 'folds,' which Christ, the Good Shepherd, will gather into a single 'flock.'

As a further example, take John xvii. 12: "While I was with them in the world I *kept* them in thy name. Those that Thou gavest me I have *kept*, and none of them is lost." It is not a great matter, yet who would not gather from this 'kept' recurring twice in this verse, that there must be also in the original some word of the like recurrence? Yet it is not so; the first 'kept' is *terein*, and the second *phulassein:* nor are *terein* and *phulassein* here such mere synonyms, that the distinction between them may be effaced without loss. The first is 'servare,' or better, 'conser-

Digitized by Google

vare' (preserve), the second 'custodire' (watch over); and the first, the keeping or preserving, is the consequence of the second, the guarding. What the Lord would say is: "I so guarded, so protected *(ephulaxa)*, those whom Thou hast given me, that I kept and preserved them (this the *teresis)* unto the present day." Thus Lampe: "*Terein* is more general, and can express the *final* preservation of the new life; *phulassein* more specially denotes the means by which this end is secured." He quotes excellently to the point, Prov. xix. 6: "He that keepeth *(phulassei)* the commandment, preserveth *(terei)* his own soul."

A VISIT TO OHIO AND PENNSYLVANIA.

I had the pleasure of attending several annual meetings in Ohio,—those of Stark, Wayne and Ashland counties,—and also the State Missionary meeting of Pennsylvania, at Lockhaven. The Stark county meeting, at Canton, I especially enjoyed, as it was in the midst of the scenes and the people connected with my earliest years in the United States,—my "first home" in America, endeared to me by a thousand associations. Here, in this county, is where I first learned to know the reformation movement and the Christian brotherhood with which my life is now connected. I met a good number of my earliest associates, friends and brethren, at Canton. Their greeting was true and cordial, as in the long years past, when life was young with us;—many, thank God, are true and faithful to their Christian profession yet; years have only made their Christian life richer and fuller,—more firmly rooted within them. This kind treatment and the generous, warm appreciation received from my old, long-tried brethren and sisters in Stark county, was like a balm to the soul, refreshing, cheerful, and encouraging. The county was well represented,—east, west, north, and south. The meeting was held in a very beautiful grove, east of the city,—one of the most suitable places I have ever seen for such an occasion. The audience on Sunday was an immense one; several thousands sat under the trees listening to the preaching of the Word of Life; and without policeman or beadle, the best of order was kept. The city papers spoke in the highest terms of the character of the meeting.

Digitized by Google

A good number of preaching brethren were present, all contributing to the interest of the meeting. Bro. J. H. Jones did a large part of the preaching, with whom I co-operated. A number of persons made a profession of their faith in Christ, and their baptism was witnessed by a large number of people. The people of Canton gave us a good hearing, and we preached by invitation in several of the churches of the city. The brethren felt that the meeting was one of the most profitable ones ever held in Canton by us, and were greatly encouraged. Brother Chapman, their preacher, is highly esteemed by the church, and deservedly so. May the church at Canton have a bright future, after its many trials!—The city of Canton, so rapidly increasing, of such wonderful activity, and so very beautifully and every way favorably situated, should be a center of power for our cause in Stark county, and in the eastern part of Ohio.

From Canton, I hastened on Monday afternoon to New Lisbon, where the Columbiana county meeting had been held *at the same time*,—an untoward coincidence that will be hereafter avoided, as two adjoining counties should not have their yearly meetings at the same time. At New Lisbon it was a joy to meet bro. Robt. Graham, who had come from Kentucky to preach at this meeting, bro. Wm. Baxter, resident preacher here, and brother Lanphear, of Warren, whose home New Lisbon had so long been. Robert Graham, Wm. Baxter and myself were room-mates at Bethany College for several years, shared in those days mutual cares and mutual joys;—here, after so many years—*post tot casus, et tanta discrimina rerum*, we were together again, free and happy as in the days of *auld lang syne*, bating not a jot of hope or spirit; indeed, on the part of my two companions, bald heads, premature perhaps,—on my part gray hairs at least,—had not killed nor even much subdued the old youthful spirit of college days. We gave it free vent and it did us good! And who, besides, could enter with us into the true cordiality of the hour better than Wesley Lanphear, by nature fitted for it by a true brother's heart, and intimate of old with all three. The meeting at New Lisbon had been a good one. The annual meetings in Columbiana county, in past years, have always had an enviable fame. The church at New Lisbon is in a good, prosperous condition, and the brethren are pleased with brother Baxter, who seems to be pleasantly situated here.

Digitized by Google

From New Lisbon I hastened to Lockhaven, in the center of Pennsylvania, to attend the State meeting there, accompanied as far as Pittsburg by brother Graham. The route over the lofty Alleghanies, and up the Bald Eagle Valley,—all by rail, to Lockhaven, is a delightful one, as every one knows who has traveled it. It is a joy to the soul to rush on thus with the iron horse over and among these grand mountains. At Tyrone I met bro. James Darsie, whom to know is to appreciate as a true man of God,—a true Nathanael-spirit, in whom there is no guile. He was also also going to Lockhaven, as he was the Corresponding Secretary of the State Mission, in which he takes the deepest interest.

The meeting at Lockhaven was but meagerly attended by brethren from other parts of the State. With the exception of brother Gilbert of Baltimore, and a few brethren from about Pittsburg, the attendance was almost entirely confined to the brotherhood of Lockhaven and the neighborhood,—including Center county. In consequence of this, no action was taken to accept, for Pennsylvania, the "Louisville plan" of missionary co-operation;—this was deferred to the next annual meeting. It is greatly to be regretted that so very little interest was manifested by the State in this meeting, held in one of the most accessible, central, and otherwise desirable localities. The church at Lockhaven is a good one, with an excellent membership, a good preacher,—brother Kinter,—and a very excellent meeting-house. The meeting was a pleasant one for us who attended. Bro. Darsie, the Corresponding Secretary of the Pennsylvania Missionary So-Society, is ever full of zeal, devotion and hope in the Lord's cause, and had many good things to say of the cause in the State, but also reported some influences very adverse to the mission cause in the State,—influences working from abroad, and most disastrously.

The meeting at Blachleysville, in Wayne county, Ohio, was a very delightful one. On Lord's day the audience in the grove was very large and very attentive. We have a large brotherhood scattered over this rich country, including Wayne and Holmes counties. It was a fine sight to see the carriages streaming in on every road to the grove where the meeting was held. Bro. Constant Lake, of Wooster, of course presided over the meeting with great efficiency; his cheerful presence is never wanting on these occasions. I met here again bro. J. H. Jones, as one of the chief

Digitized by Google

speakers. This neighborhood is one of the chief fields of his early labors;—everybody knows him and welcomes him here.—Our veteran brother Moody was also here, earnest and zealous as of old; so also brother Stark, from Millersburg, and others, whom it was good to hear.

The meeting at Ashland was well attended by brethren from that district, and it was good to see again so many old acquaintances and to form new ones. The meetings were held in the old church, and in a large commodious hall in the town, and were well attended throughout. Brother Woods, from Mansfield, presided over the meetings. A number of preaching brethren were present, among them brethren Moody, Rowe, Pearre, Rumford, Woods, Riddle, and others. To me the visit to Ashland was a very pleasant one. C. L. L.

WEST VIRGINIA MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

WEST LIBERTY, W. Va., September 21st, 1870.

DEAR BROTHER PENDLETON:—I entered upon the duties and work of Corresponding Secretary of the Missionary Board of West Virginia, to which I was called by the State Meeting, held in Wheeling May last, on the first of August. Since that time I have met with the delegates from the various churches, in their several Annual Conventions, in the three districts formed in the State by the Board. First, at Beeler's Station, in Marshall county, embracing the Pan Handle, which we call District No. 1. Second, at Doll's Run, Monongalia county, the boundary of which is yet left open until the brethren's wishes in the case are more fully known. This is No. 2. And third, at Buffalo, in Tyler county, for the present embracing an indefinite limit, No. 3. Each of these districts very willingly and harmoniously organized for missionary work, substantially on the plan commended at Louisville last fall, with a Board, Corresponding Secretary, &c., and desire to have the gospel spread in our State and elsewhere. Many of the brethren are glad that we are arranging for more united and harmonious work in the Master's cause. We need united, concentrated effort, as a people. We have been pleading, both with the tongue and pen, for union among the people of God, for many years; but, we have not always, in

Digitized by Google

our action among ourselves, recommended the principle as highly as we should have done, and sometimes it is the case that those who say most on the subject of union, are the most difficult to influence, to associate and co-operate with their brethren, in any general plan, for the furtherance of the cause of Christ. Our people have been so afraid of ecclesiasticism, that many have run into the opposite extreme; and, to use a military phrase, have been "bush-whacking," every little congregation and preacher fighting just as each one chose. This was a kind of necessity for awhile, no doubt, and something has been gained for the Master's cause, but we are now a great people—a power in the earth, and the time has certainly come, when we, as a great army, united under our King and General, should march on as a unit, to deeds of daring and victory. I am glad to know that this is the feeling of many of our leading spirits in almost every State of the Union; and that preacher or editor, who, for fear that some one shall surpass or excel him before the public, when they shall stand face to face, will not meet with an enlightened brotherhood in all things, in harmony with the spirit and genious of our holy religion, had as well stand aside at once, or shut himself up in that little egotistical nutshell by which he is surrounded, and there enjoy the exquisite satisfaction of knowing that, "I am monarch of all I survey." But, enough of this for the present.

In a part of West Virginia, our plea for a return to original Christianity has scarcely been heard of as yet, being mountainous and off the great thoroughfares of travel and commerce. I have recently traveled near three hundred miles on horseback, in the interior, and find many congregations of disciples, small and weak, with no regular preaching, and not always in the best of order. In one of these tours of some ten or twelve days, I enjoyed the company and hearty co-operation of our very estimable Brother David Anguish, of Glen Easton, Marshall county, whose praise is in all the churches of the saints where he is known. We met, too, in these conventions, nearly all the preaching brethren included within their bounds, and had a pleasant, and I trust, a profitable conference with them, in reference to the advance movement of the army of the Lord. All are for immediate action all along the line, and if the brethren of the State will only furnish us the necessary means to carry on the campaign properly, I think they will hear a good report from their officers

Digitized by Google

presently. The Macedonian cry is coming up freely from many a county site or smaller village, and the work of holding what we have gained, is pressing heavily upon us; for, it is a fact well known to many, that some of our Evangelists are fine enlisters, but very poor drillers, and the work of the ministry being thus not more than half done, has often resulted very unfavorably in many localities. These evils we wish to remedy as fast as possible, and we would urge upon the churches the importance of care in selecting and setting apart men to the ministry of the word. This is too holy and important a work to be committed to men who are not deeply pious, and no man in this age can be fitted for this work in heart and head in a few days. The Saviour selected from among the disciples twelve and kept them with him for some years, doubtless, before he sent them out on their great commission; and the apostle Paul took young men with him for ten or twelve years, before he left them in districts or cities, to set in order the things that were wanting, and this, too, in an age of miracles. These and other examples in the New Testament should suggest to the lovers of a Bible Christianity, care and caution here. Some of our Evangelists, too, have laid hands suddenly on men for the eldership, contrary to the express injunction of the apostle, and in almost every case the effect has been bad. It cannot be otherwise. I find the cause of Christ retarded by both of these evils, in some localities in our State, and I do insist upon the brethren's being more careful in these respects.

We are arranging as best we can to have every disciple of Christ seen and enlisted in the missionary work, as the State Board suggests, and thus, if possible, get the whole church at work to spread the gospel by their united means and influence.

We have succeeded, thus far, fully as well in this work as we anticipated, but united effort is necessary to success.

Resolutions were adopted at these conventions, heartily endorsing the movements of the State Convention and State Board in their efforts to evangelize the State, and asking the State Board to continue their work until next season, and then call a State meeting, at such time and place as they think best; also to have the State represented this fall, in the General Convention at Indianapolis.

Your Brother in Christ,

A. E. MYERS.

Digitized by Google

ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING IN ENGLAND.

The *British Harbinger* for September, brings us a report of the annual meeting of the churches in the United Kingdom, held at Newcastle-on Tyne, August 9, 10, 11. From this very interesting report we select some items which we know will interest our readers, for there is quite a desire among our brethren here in America to know of the state of the churches in the British Islands.

The report shows that there are in England 67 churches, in Scotland 25, in Wales 18, and in Ireland 1. The entire number of members reported is 4002; the schedules in this respect are doubtless defective, as we see no membership at all given in many cases. In England there are several churches with a considerable membership each. The largest is that of one of the three churches in Birmingham, which has 210 members; there are two other churches in this city, one with 140, the other with 54 members. London reports 4 churches, the largest of which is in Camden Town, 153 members; that at Chelsea has 93. The second largest church is at Wigan, 187 members; the church at Liverpool reports 150. There are several other churches reporting each over 100 members. Of the churches in Scotland, some are quite small, others give no membership. The largest churches are, in order of strength, those at Glasgow, Edinburg and Dundee, having respectively, 170, 126, and 109 members. In Wales, the largest has 67 members. The one church in Ireland has 53. The entire number of additions reported during the year, by immersion, is 308. We find, however, that the number of persons separated —231, and of deaths, 65, in all, 296, almost equals the additions. A noteworthy fact is the vigorous discipline exercised in the matter of separation. In a church *now* of 153, 16 were separated; one of 140, 20; one of 137, 26; and one now numbering 27, reports 17 separations. A number of the churches report Sunday Schools, with a good number of scholars and teachers;—in all, however, but 18 schools are reported.

The receipts reported,—from 20 churches in England and one in Scotland, sum up a little over 123 pounds sterling; and from various individuals in England, Scotland and Wales, 406£ 10s.—making a total of a little over 600£ sterling, about 3000 dollars. With reference to this matter, the report says "The attention of

Digitized by Google

our last Annual Gathering was closely directed to the desirability of considerably increasing our resources, and, in accordance with the recommendation then made, your committee urged upon the officers of churches, and the brethren generally, the duty of adopting some well-devised plan for securing a larger amount of contributions to the fund. Had the immediate need for such an augmentation continued, we have no doubt the response would have been adequate to the demand. But the unexpected withdrawal from the general co-operation of our esteemed brethren King and Hindle, postponed for a time the necessity of following up this important work."

The superintendence of this general co-operation of the churches is placed, during the year, into the hands of an "Evangelist Committee," constituting what we would call an "Executive Committee," who seem to do their work to the satisfaction of the brethren.

We find the following *item* in the report:

"The question of the churches adopting, for census and other public documents, one only of the designations of the church found in the New Testament, having been mooted in letters from eight churches, a most interesting discussion took place, showing that thoughtful brethren throughout the country had been searching the Scriptures on this subject. It was finally resolved.—That the churches throughout the kingdom be recommended to use in all public documents the name 'Church of Christ,' and that individuals designate themselves Christians."

The evangelists for last year whose labors are given, are, brethren D. King, E. Evans, W. McDougall, W. Hindle, and J. Strang; two brethren, Ellis and Adam, are added to the list of preachers for the coming year.

Among the names of brethren present at the meeting, we notice several whom we met two years ago on the other side of the ocean, and that awake pleasant memories,—such are brethren McDougall, Tickle, Collins, Linn and Strang. God bless all these dear brethren in their labors of love! The next annual meeting is to be held at Huddersfield.

We still feel, and cannot but *deeply* feel, that there should be a closer intimacy and a fuller, heartier co-operation between the brotherhood on the two sides of the Atlantic, and we hope yet to see this. It would be well for some of our good worthy men to spend some time in the British Islands, to aid our brethren there in the good work. We are strong here,—there the brethren are,

Digitized by Google

in numbers, weak, yet full of the love of the Lord and his cause. We send our dear brethren there a hearty greeting, and may be, if the Lord will, we may yet see them again in the flesh, face to face.

C. L. L.

NEW ARRANGEMENT FOR THE CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK.

REDUCTION IN PRICES.

Our contract with H. S. Bosworth, for the publication of the Christian Hymn Book having expired, we have contracted with Bosworth, Chase & Hall, of Cincinnati, to continue its publication. In order to carry out the wishes of Brother Campbell, we have decided to make considerable reduction in the prices of those styles of the Hymn Book most in use, as named below. This has hitherto been impracticable, owing to the cost of stereotyping the several editions of the book. While the book will be lessened in price, improved mechanical facilities will enable the publishers to produce books in superior bindings, and the whole "make-up" of the book will, we are confident, be equal to its acknowledged excellencies in other respects.

PRICES.—Pearl,	48mo.,	Sheep,	reduced	from	60 to 50 cts.
"	"	arabesque,	"	"	65 to 60 cts.
Brevier,	24mo.,	Sheep,	"	"	90 to 75 cts.
"	"	ara., plain,	"	"	1.10 to 1.00
"	"	ara., gilt,	"	"	1.25 to 1.15

with a discount of 20 per cent. by the dozen, and liberal rates to the trade.

We also take pleasure in announcing, as has been the intention of the trustees from the beginning, that we have had in progress for months past, a

HYMN AND TUNE BOOK,

in the compilation of which we have employed the best musical talent the country affords. This book we expect to have ready for sale at an early day, and are confident that it will meet the approval of our brotherhood. It will be published in the very best style, in convenient form and size, and sold at low rates, corresponding with those of the Hymn Book, which will make it the cheapest book of the kind published in the United States.

R. M. BISHOP, Chn. Board of Trustees.

Digitized by Google

NEW BOOK STORE IN WHEELING, W. VA.

CAMPBELL & MCDERMOT have recently commenced business in the city of Wheeling, and will supply at the usual rates, Books and Stationery; including all the works published by our brethren. The facilities for shipping from this point to all parts of the country are unsurpassed. We solicit orders, and will endeavor to fill them promptly.

The following works are furnished at prices annexed:

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK—NEW EDITION.

	retail.	*per doz.*		*retail.*	*per doz.*
Sheep Binding,	$ .90	$8.10	Turkey Super,	$2.50	$24.00
Arabesque,	1.10	9.90	" " gilt clasp	2.75	24.75
" gilt back	1.25	11.25	" " Antique	3.00	27.00
English Turkey,	1 60	14.40			

Sent by mail PREPAID at the retail price. By the dozen, remit for postage, $1.50.

CHRISTIAN HYMN BOOK, Small Edition, in various styles of binding.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM—With its Antecedents and Consequents. $1.25, *mailed postage free.* This is regarded as one of brother Campbell's best works. It unfolds the plan of salvation in all its fullness and completeness. We will dispose of this work by the quantity at unusually low rates.

CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, - - -	$1.40	OWEN DEBATE, - - - -	$1.50
LIFE THOS. CAMPBELL by A. C	1.40	CHRISTIAN BAPTIST, muslin,	3.00
PURCELL DEBATE, - - - -	1.40	" " Arabesque,	3.50
D. S. BURNET'S ADDRESS on A. C.	.10	ROTHERHAM on the GREEK ART.	.40

Postage on Christian Baptist, 40 cts.

PRINCIPLES and OBJECTS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, urged by A. Campbell and others, by R. Richardson. Paper, 10 cents; Flexible Muslin, 25 cts; Arabesque, 50 cts; English Turkey, $1.00 Tukey Super, $1.25. By the dozen, *one-fourth off.* Remit for postage—from 15 to 50 cts per doz.

THE ORGANON OF SCRIPTURE; or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. $1.25.

REASON AND REVELATION.—A new work by R. Milligan, President of the College of the Bible, Kentucky University. Price $2 00. Postage, 20 cents

DR. R. RICHARDSON'S LIFE OF A. CAMPBELL. $3.50. Postage, 40cts.
SCHEME OF REDEMPTION, by R. Milligan. - 2.50. " 30cts.

BIBLE UNION EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

OCTAVO PICA EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding, - -	$2 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	$3 00
Extra " " - - -	2 50	Roan, Gilt Edges, - - -	3 50
Sheep " " - - -	2 50	Imitation, T'ky Morocco, Gilt,	4 00

18MO EDITION—RULED BORDER LINES.

Plain Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 75	Sheep, Strong Binding, - -	$1 40
Extra Cloth Binding, - -	1 00	Roan, Marble Edges, - -	1 50

32MO SUNDAY SCHOOL EDITION.

Plain Cloth Binding - , -	5	Extra Cloth, - - - - - -	$ 40
Plain Cloth Gilt, - - - -	30	Roan, Marble Edges - -	50
Extra Cloth, Extra Gilt, -	75	Roan, Gilt, - - - -	1 00

Address all orders CAMPBELL & McDERMOT,
134 MAIN-ST., WHEELING, W. V.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., OCTOBER, 1870. [No. X.

UNITARIANISM.

It is evident that Unitarianism is at present making strong efforts to arouse itself into life and power. The thoughtful and earnest men among them,—those of really strong religious feeling,—must have long since been impressed and oppressed with the mortal decay both of doctrine and life, and the paralysis of all moral and spiritual power, that have marked the present history of Unitarianism. Intellectual men and culture they have among them to a good degree, but of marked, living piety, that works in a spiritual way, with conservative and saving power, on individuals and on society, they have well nigh lost all. Intellectual and æsthetic culture is not Christianity. While the latter is not opposed to the former but does in the highest degree sympathize and harmonize with it, and foster it,—yet such culture may be away from, and without any real sympathy for, the doctrine and life of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Moreover, Unitarianism, since its beginnings in New England, has been a history of a steady, within late years quite rapid, descent from evangelical Christianity toward the abyss of the lowest rationalism, that glories alone in the human, whose creed is no-faith, and whose affirmations are all negations.

The name Unitarian has covered the wildest license and the widest diversity of religious thought, so that it has become a synonym—and by some gloried in as such—of unbridled freedom of religious opinion, or rather often, of opinions *about* religion,—

Digitized by Google

for in some instances of unitarian preaching, the very name religion, in any allowable Christian sense, was no longer applicable. Things have been long utterly adrift in this sea of Unitarianism, without any unity of doctrine, life, power or action; every man doing that which is right in his own eyes. Its elements, like Virgils's shipwrecked men—

——rari, nantes in gurgite vasto,—

have been drifting, hither and thither, on the sea of religious life.

All this has been seen and felt by its better men, who are unwilling to stand in such helpless weakness before men,—a mere negative power in the world. These men of strong and earnest convictions, feeling a consciousness of power within themselves and their cause, and believing that there was a large element and a widely extended feeling in society that would respond to their plea, have been anxious to rally the forces of Unitarianism into union, harmony and power, that they might go forth and "take the land."

There is evidently a waking up,—what evangelicals would call a 'revival,' among Unitarians. At their last National Conference, that was very well attended, a strong effort was made, as they think with remarkable success, to bring the distracted and discordant elements together, to adopt a religious 'platform,' or creed, wide enough to give ample sea-room to 'liberal' opinion, but that would yet hold them together; and to adopt measures for what might be called, if such a thing could be said of Unitarianism, *missionary* activity. The effort at adopting a platform, or creed, met with excited opposition from many, yet was victorilousy carried through by the majority, the friends of this measure numbering among them some of the strongest men of the denomination.

While we are removed as far as can be from all fellowship and sympathy with Unitarianism of every form and degree, we can not but feel an interest in its history; because, on the one side, it illustrates before our own eyes the normal fate of every religious development that denies the ancient, New Testament faith in the divinity of Jesus Christ,—that the whole edifice of Christian truth and life goes down with any abandonment of this great fundamental truth;—then, also, because, on the other side, there are

Digitized by Google

still men in the ranks of Unitarianism who seem not to be willing to abandon Christ altogether,—who shrink obviously from the extreme to which Unitarianism has led others, the many, and who represent a feeling that may yet, some day, and in some way, cause many to retrace their steps,—as has been the case in Germany, and go back to the true Bible faith in Christ and his Word.

We do not intend to notice or review now the platform recently adopted for a general expression of their faith and a kind of rallying-place,—or as a kind of anchor to their ship. We merely want to give our readers some notion of what the various types of teaching are in the broad, liberal boundaries of Unitarianism; and this will also show what kind of "unity of faith" exists, is possible, and is tolerated to-day in the Unitarian brotherhood of "Liberal Christianity," to which all are invited to come as the true religion of Christ and the great hope of society.

Immediately after their National Conference, the leading Unitarian preachers delivered themselves in the pulpit on the Conference and the things achieved by it. Reports of the sermons of Frothingham, Hepworth, and Dr. Bellows, all of New York city, are before us, from which we give some extracts. The Rev. O. B. Frothingham represents the so-called 'radical wing' of the denomination,—enjoying, however, with his 'society,' the fellowship of the brotherhood. In his sermon he gives fully the creed of his 'wing'; the following are characteristic passages:

"The Radical believes in God in the most positive, cordial and determined manner; not in the God of any particular church or confession; not in any special or individual God; not, let me say, in a God, but simply and only in God; not in a God who tears up his own roads and mines his own bridges to visit his own children in the city he has provided for them, who listens to private prayers, takes an interest in private persons, and prints books for his favorite tribes of men. The God of Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, the Radical knows not. He knows only God. Of this King he does not dare to attempt a definition; rather he tries to break through all definition that He may be absolutely without limit or limitation, pure spirit, pure intelligence, the fullest ideal of possibility, the fairest dream of the soul. The more definitions the better, if there must be definitions at all; welcome to all there are or can be rather than rest in any one. All put to-

Digitized by Google

gether will not sufficiently declare what the Infinite is:—We need the multitude of your thoughts to save us from the tyranny of a single creed. Of the moral attributes of God the Radical hesitates also to speak. Indeed he dislikes the word "attribute" as implying faculties distinct from being. He does not say that God is *loving*, but that He is Love. It is not enough to say that He is wise for He is Wisdom; or that He is just for He is Justice. To this belief it is inconceivable that He should hold any outcast for any cause whatever; that he should dig a hell big enoug to hold a fly, or erect a barrier that would shut out a bird. The Radical's God is simply a dream of all conceivable perfection, the perfect Thought, Will, Care, Providence, in whom none die, but in whom all who live at all, live, move, and have their being.

"The Radical belives in *Revelation*, not in incidental, particular, peculiar, or individual revelation, but in *Revelation*. God cannot hide, disappear, vail, or withdraw himself. He spoke creation into existence, and creation is His articulated word. Revelation is the opening of our eyes. The natural eye, trained, tutored, and taught, looks directly into God's countenance and sees as much of Him as sense can see in the transcendent loveliness of earth, sea, sky. The intellectual eye opens and discovers wonders of law, system, order, harmony in whose presence thought stands enchanted. The moral eye opens and new realms of duty appear in the awful forms of Truth, Obedience, Duty. The spiritual eye opens last and lo! The Godhead widens on man,s view: God is recognized as Father and Mother, the Savior and never-forgetting friend. It will be seen at once why the highest revelations are made to the very few. There are very few who have the spiritual eye open and clear. The pure in heart see God face to face, whether Pagan, Christian, Turk or Jew; whether men of Jerusalem or men of New York, whether priests or philosophers, prophets or cobblers, men, matrons or maids, the pure in Heart and none others see God.

"The Radical believes in Christianity—not a sthe only, absolute, or final religion, not as the finest expression of the religious sentiment, but as the most worthy form of it yet manifest. It is dear to him as implying the purity of moral standard, sweetness of spiritual grace, tenderness and strength of personal and social aspiration, hopefulness in regard to human destiny. The Christianity of the Radical is so attenuated as not to be recognized by

Digitized by Google

popular Christendom; but it is not so attenuated as to be to him merely a shadow. It is a thing he naturally appropriates, not a thing by which he allows himself to be appropriated.

"The Radical believes in Jesus; not in 'The Christ,' but in Jesus as the highest expression of the religious sentiment in human form. Yes, on the whole, the highest manifestation of God. We do not make him the foundation or the corner-stone of our faith. He is the child of human nature, not its King. The heart sees in him the expression of its highest feeling, and is encouraged, cheered, invigorated, consoled by the persuasion that in him its highest feeling has been realized. What men are we know, and the knowledge is bitter indeed—agonizing, at times almost maddening. What they may become, what capacities lie in them, what possibilities are theirs, we see in this fair, shadowy form of Jesus; in this name we stand over the tombs of those who are dead in trespasses and sins, and cry come forth!

"The Radical believes in immortality and three of the grand declarations of the religious nature of man. Not because Jesus himself received it from the conviction of humanity, but because the religious nature asseverates and has always asseverated the truth, that the more it is enlightened the more positively it asseverates it; that the greatest souls are the most confident of it, while the smallest souls are the most doubting. The Radical is interested in immortality as a high religious belief. On this great belief he does not venture to dogmatise with narrow interpretations. He desires rather that it should be voiced in the most comprehensive manner, by the most variously attuned moods. He loves to have it presented in all possible aspect, that it may respond to all aspirations.

"The Radical believes in as much of the Bible as answers to his cultured reason and matured conviction. He takes what nourishes him and leaves the rest. He reads it as he reads other books, and judges it. Inspiration is in intelligence not in print. The true things in the Bible are not true because they are there; they are there because they are true. The religious nature always brings the Book to judgment. The orthodox Abolitionist wrung from the Old Testament the last drop of the virus of Slavery before he leaned his conscience against it. A refined age rejects the coarseness of the Bible. A knowing age rejects the ignorance of it. A moral age discards its immoralities. A spiritual age turns

Digitized by Google

its raw statements into allegory, or turns away from them altogether. There are many Bibles. All the soul's writings are scriptures, wherever and by whomsoever penned.

"The Radical believes the world to be humanized. That the men and women in it are to be made nobler and better; that Society is to be regenerated by the action of the natural laws of reason and goodness. He believes in the highest education of all men and women, in the largest possession of rights, the freest sharing of opportunities, the most cordial participation in privileges, the richest unfolding of powers. He believes in the good time coming, the Kingdom of God, the heavenly Republic in which educated reason and experienced conscience shall be the ground of order, peace, and felicity."

This is one side of Unitarian liberal Christianity, what it is cannot be misunderstood. The Society, as it is called, to which Mr. Frothingham preaches, is small. No one will be surprised, after reading the above extracts, that to this Society was preached by Rev. O. B. Frothingham his Sermon on '*Elective Affinity*' (conjugal affinity) in justification of the part he took in the Richardson-McFarland marriage. The President of the Board of Trustees of this Society is Oliver Johnson, managing editor of the *Independent*, and of whom we spoke last year in our reference to the tendencies of that paper. Frothingham's Sermon on the abominable doctrine of '*elective* conjugal affinity,' was published by request of the 'Society';—whether we were justified in what we then said of this Mr. Johnson, these facts, with the above passages, may decide. The religion of this 'Society' as seen in the Sermon of Mr. Frothingham is but very little better than Deism.—it cannot have the slightest claim to New Testament Christianity; to the religion of Jesus it is infidel. Let these people believe and teach what they do, if they like, and let them have full credit for their creed; but for them to come before the believing and unbelieving world, that know what the character and claims of the New Testament are, with the pretense of being Christians,—New Testament Christians, manifests a degree of excessive delusion, or of shameless impudence, and of presumption on the stupidity and credulity of men, that is beyond all toleration.

The Reverend Mr. Hepworth, a leading spirit in carrying

Digitized by Google

through the platform of faith, holds a language different from his brother Frothingham. He says:

"Our religion is inclusive, not exclusive. It insists that the only true road to heaven lies by the way to Bethlehem, and Nazareth, and Calvary. We say that Brahminism is good; everything is good that makes men better. We do not revile the teachings of Confucius, or Socrates, or Plato; but we say that the Gospel of Jesus Christ is the one machine that is to do our work, and it includes everything else—love to God and love to man that was taught in the Orient; it includes love to man taught by Socrates and Plato. It includes all and very much more, and we shall reach the very best results. It does not mean going about doing good, but the word means a man who desires to be a follower of the Lord Jesus Christ. It is a personal matter. That point is indubitably fixed, and is the point upon which our denomination swings.

"In the second place, we have established our denominational allegiance to Jesus Christ. The world has been constantly looking at us and sowing maledictions, and has determined to misunderstand us. It has vilified and calumniated us in every way, and the animus of this misrepresentation has been neither charitable nor friendly or fraternal. It is not fair to speak on a subject if you know nothing about it, and it is unfair to preach anything to the community unless after careful examination you come to the conclusion that the thing is evil. My duty is to pledge the Unitarian body, as ever, to an allegiance undisputed and unqualified not simply to the technical terms 'Christ' and 'Christianity,' but to the definite term 'gospel.' I wanted and I succeeded in the work in putting it right before the world as to its belief in and its allegiance to the gospel, as well as to the character of Him who is our Lord and Master, and there we stand to-day—stand there grandly, I think. There is no sect in Christendom that stands upon as solid and upon as generous a platform as the Unitarians of this moment, and there is no system of thought which has so large a claim upon the common sense as well as upon the scholarship of the community. We have crystallized in the constitution a love for good."

Dr. Bellows talks much like his brother Hepworth. There are two very serious, insurmountable objections to the platform of

Digitized by Google

these men and this people that will forever prevent its acceptance by what they call orthodox Christians. One is, that, in spite of their bold words of allegiance to Christ Jesus as the head and Lord, and of all the fine things they say about him, when it comes to a clear definition of their faith in Christ,—it transpires that his Godhead is denied. This alone is enough to forbid evangelical Christians to sympathize with Unitarianism. But, in the second place, the additional fact, that this fraternity allows such intolerable licentious freedom among them as represented by such men as Frothingham, Burleigh and many others, seals at once their condemnation in the light of the New Testament and intelligent Christian consciences. Liberty is precious, but unbridled license is not. We cannot confound these two; the word of God forbids it.

Dr. Bellows says: "We must have perfect individual liberty of faith and action in the private bosom and individual churches with which we are connected. ..... We have no inquisitorial tribunal to determine whether you are a Christian or not. We have nothing but a certain point, and that is our faith in the perfect loyalty to the Lord Jesus Christ. That is our creed—one God—and we recognize every man who is faithful to that creed.

"We want to have a platform which is broad enough for all sincere and earnest believers in the liberties of Christ to come and feel that there is a National Church, a Church Universal, in which all the diversities and differences of theological opinions should be lost in a common feeling of that mighty, blessed rule which binds us all together."

This all sounds very well; but when we have seen the real, practical, definition and illustration of the broad liberty here offered to us, when we know it is not the liberty of the Gospel wherewith Christ has blessed us, that it is a liberty unallowed by the New Testament doctrine, and one that is simply destructive, we can but reject it. There is a strong tendency, however, manifested everywhere, to this false 'liberty' of licentiousness, that the people of God must evermore with all faithfulness warn and strive against. What serious Christian that has any regard for the sacredness of Bible truth, and our obligations to maintain it, does not shrink from the "liberty" of such a fellowship as this very Mr. Hepworth declared exists in the Unitarian fold? 'We have in fellowship with us," he said, "not only the Chris-

Digitized by Google

tian Unitarian, who would not lay his finger upon any part of the Scripture to remove it, but also the Free Religionist, who would lay his whole hand on the Bible and throw it away, bodily. Our differences cross the boundary of Christianity, and go to the utmost limits of Theism, which ..... speaks of the blood of Christ and the blood of Cock Robin in the same breath, and tells us we have already had too much of Jesus Christ, and that he should be laid to rest." Such is Unitarian fellowship; and to this we say, what can be the respect for the Lord Jesus Christ and the Bible on the part of those themselves who, pretending to a better faith, can *endure* such a fellowship as this? what must be their *own* views of and faith in Jesus? The answer suggests itself to every intelligent mind!

But, we are told, these "Christian Unitarians" speak most reverently and energetically of Jesus Christ. Here precisely is the point to be looked into; here is the deception. It is by no means what men may say in words, that decides, but what men *mean* by their words. A Universalist will not for a moment hesitate to declare that the unrighteous "will go into *everlasting* punishment," —for that is the very language of Scripture; the Materialist will affirm this also. It is the *definition* they give that reveals their true views. So of the Unitarian. An immense amount of deception is in this way practised. We must ask men what they *mean* by their words; definitions are absolutely necessary. Let us see how the "Christian Unitarians," the better wing, talked about the phrase "The Lord Jesus Christ." The "left" or "Free Religionist" wing opposed the introduction of this expression into the platform, and one of the "Christian" advocates of it, tried thus to placate and satisfy the "left." He said, "the word Christ is not English, but transferred Greek. It means *anointed*. Where, then, in the Old Testament, we read that Saul was anointed, and David, and Jehu, and Hazael, we have then nothing else than 'the Lord *Saul* Christ,' 'the Lord *David* Christ,' 'the Lord *Jehu* Christ;' and in the same way you can interpret 'the Lord Jesus Christ.' What more can the *left* desire?" Not a man in the conference rebuked this opened-faced, contemptible *chicanery*, this scandalous justification of deceit. In this fashion, these men teach one another openly to practice equivocation and dishonorable maneuverings in the most solemn matters of religion.

What confidence can anybody have in the statement of their

Digitized by Google

faith in Christ, or their belief in any of the other essential truths of the Christian religion, when we hear them thus declare, that with them all that is asked is to consent and repeat a formula of words, which every man is allowed to explain as he pleases; by which one man may mean one thing, another something quite different or precisely the opposite, and the third nothing at all? If this is not perverting truth, and breaking down all the integrity of truth in the conscience, we could not imagine what is.

The fact is, there is no further hope when the Godhood of Jesus is taken away from our Christian faith,—all then is lost. The Christianity that is without this,—is dead; it is then, as Alexander Campbell justly said, with reference to Unitarianism, a fair marble statue,—beautiful it may be, but cold,—dead! Moreover, it becomes inevitably a system of falsehood and deceit,—"deceiving and being deceived." Therefore, no alliance, no forbearance forever, with any sort of Unitarianism from the highest to the lowest, from the Semi-Arianism of the fourth century to the low Socinianism of the later ages. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was *God*," is our eternal watchword. C. L. L.

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

A LECTURE.

The fundamental doctrine of the primitive church was the revelation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Its origin, we may without question affirm, was in the baptismal formula (Matt. 28; 19). The apostles were to baptize *into the name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. The distinction of three persons is clearly taught elsewhere in the Scriptures. Paul says, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same *Spirit*, and there are differences of administrations but the same Lord, and there are diversities of operations but the same God, which worketh all in all." (1 Cor. 12: 4–6.) In the benediction at the close of the second Epistle to the Corinthians, he says: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all" (2 Cor. 12: 14). Throughout

Digitized by Google

the Scriptures this three-fold manifestation of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit is assumed. It is not set forth speculatively, nor is there any attempt to explain it, or reduce it to a scientific apprehension. Yet it is everywhere recognized as fundamental in the Christian economy. There can be little or no doubt that a public recognition of it was demanded or assumed in the confession of every candidate for baptism.

The earliest formula of faith found in ecclesiastical history, called the "apostolic creed," is but little more than an expression of these cardinal points. While it is now generally conceded by scholars, that the apostles did not formally construct this creed as it is now preserved in the history of symbols, yet it is found at so early a date, and has been so universally accepted as a true expression of apostolic teaching on the subject, that we cannot but regard it as of next to divine in authority. It reads, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth, and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried. He descended into hell; the third day he arose from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and in life everlasting." The author under the name of St. Austin, pretends to give us the particular part of this creed which each of the apostles contributed, and while this is evidently only an overfond tradition, of no respectable authority, the probability is strong that each part was rendered necessary at a very early date, and actually introduced, to guard against corresponding opposing heresies which began to corrupt the pure doctrine of the word. According to a learned conjecture of Basnage, "The Gnostics brought in the doctrine of a two-fold deity, the one good, the other evil: against this pestilent heresy, the church put that article into her creed, 'I believe in God,' or one God. Menander, the disciple of Simon Magus, asserted, that the world was not created by God, but by angels: this occasioned the church to insert these words, 'maker of heaven and earth.' Carpocrates taught, that Jesus was a mere man, and begotten of both sexes, as other men: in opposition to whom it was inserted, that Christ

Digitized by Google

was 'conceived by the Holy Ghost.' The Basilidians did not believe Jesus was crucified by the Jews, but only Simon of Cyrene: to confute whom, they put in those words, 'He was dead and buried.' Carpocrates rejected the resurrection of the flesh: and upon that, 'I believe the resurrection of the flesh' was added to the creed." Bing. (Ant. B. x. § 7.) While this conjecture may not be correct in all its details, there is this that we may accept as true, that this creed was composed to bring out into distinct prominence these great items, as fundamental in the faith of the church, and to set them in clear opposition to all denials of them, and thus to condemn such as heretical.

This dogmatic assertion of the doctrine of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit was considered as an essential part of the *regula fidei*, with a universality that we may strictly call catholic. Irenæus, disciple of Polycarp, and Bishop of Lyons, about A. D. 177,—"a clear-headed, considerate, philosophical theologian"—says, "The church, though it be dispersed over all the world, from one end of the earth to the other, received from the apostles and their disciples the belief in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven, and earth, and sea, and all things in them; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation, and in the Holy Ghost, who preached by the prophets the dispensations of God and the advent, and nativity of a virgin, and passion, and resurrection from the dead, and bodily ascension of the flesh of his beloved son Christ Jesus our Lord into heaven, and his coming again from heaven in the glory of the Father, to recapitulate all things and raise the flesh of all mankind; that according to the will of the invisible Father, every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth and things under the earth, to Jesus Christ, our Lord, and God, and Savior and King," &c. (Iren. lib. 1. c. 1. p. 44.) This faith, he says, was the same in all the world; men professed it with one heart and one soul: for though there were different dialects in the world, yet the power of the faith was one and the same. The churches in Germany had no other tradition than those in Iberia or Spain, or those among the Celtæ, that is, France, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Lybia, or in the middle parts of the world—meaning Jerusalem and the surrounding churches.

A similar compend of "the things manifestly handed down by the apostolical preaching is given by Origen: by Tertullian

Digitized by Google

(220): by Cyprian: by Gregory Thaumaturgus: by Lucian, the martyr: in the creed of the apostolical constitutions (A. D. latter end 3rd cent.): in the creed of Jerusalem: in the creed of Cæsarea in Palestine: the creed of Antioch: the creed of Aquileia, all of which antedate the Nicene Creed, or A. D. 325.

While this faith was so universally expressed, it was not in such identity of language as to indicate that there was any one authorized or generally adopted form of this doctrine. On the contrary, there are such emphatic varieties in the forms of expressing the same general article, especially that relating to the Son, as to indicate that special controversies had already grown up as to the *sense* in which this article was to be understood, which rendered it necessary to define more particularly the sense in which it was taken by the church, and to be confessed by the candidates for baptism. These controversies were preparing the way for the doctrine of the Trinity—that is, a scientific determination of the relation in which the Father, Son and Holy Spirit stood to each other, as well as the nature of each.

This doctrine cannot be said to be fundamental in the Christian faith, because it is nowhere distinctly and dogmatically stated in the New Testament. The passage in 1 Jno. 5, relating to the *three that bare record* is conceded to be spurious, and, though there are other passages that involve it, the doctrine itself was only of gradual development. The simple foundation of the apostolic age was "faith in the only true God and in Jesus Christ whom he hath sent" (John 17: 3). The declaration of Paul is strong and unequivocal. "No other foundation can any man lay than that is laid, the annunciation of Jesus as the Messiah." The burthen of the apostolical preaching was, "that Jesus is the Christ," and upon this truth the church was built. But the mind could not rest satisfied in the bare statement of the sonship and Messiahship of Jesus. A developed Christian consciousness demanded some solution of the deep questions which naturally arose in meditative minds concerning the mystery of redemption. The Scriptures clearly set forth God in the threefold relation to mankind of Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. Paul speaks also of one God, and Father of all, who is above all, and works through all, and in all (Ephesians 4: 6); Him from whom are all things, through whom are all things, and to whom are all things. There is a revelation here, different from Deism, which separates God

Digitized by Google

from any real union with mankind altogether; and Pantheism, which confounds the two in a blind and necessary identity.

We have seen how universally the economical triad of Father, Son and Holy Spirit was received by the primitive church. But it was received in a practical way only, at first. The practical, however, had to be reduced to the ontological doctrine—and to this the church traveled through profoundest controversy. A consideration of the various prominent positions taken in this controversy will best enable us to understand the orthodox ground—the accepted doctrine of the church on the subject. This controversy was first and mainly about the sense in which the *Son* was one with the Father. The declaration of John in the opening verses of his gospel had been implicitly received as an unequivocal assertion of the one-ness of the Logos and the Theos:—"In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God;" and it was this word that became flesh and dwelt among us. The Apostolic Fathers had taken up this unqualified announcement as a *fact*, and without speculation, or any attempt at any scientific explanation of it, reasserted it again and again in their writings.

Clement of Rome says (Ep. ii. c. 1): "We ought to conceive of (φρονειν περι) Jesus Christ as of God (ὡς περι θεου) as judge of the living and the dead." Ignatius to the church at Ephesus addresses them as "united and elected by a true passion, according to the will of the Father, and of Jesus Christ our God." Writing to the church of Rome, he describes them as "Illuminated by the will of Him who willeth all things that are according to the love of Jesus Christ our God" (τω θεω ἡμων). He expresses for them the prayer that they may enjoy "abundant and uncontaminated salvation in Jesus Christ our God" (c. 3) Urging them to consider invisible rather than visible things, he says, "For even our God, Jesus Christ, being in the Father, (that is, having ascended again to the Father,) is more glorified" (that is, there than upon earth). To the Trallians he says (c. 7), "Continue inseparable from God, even Jesus Christ." To the Smyrnean church he says, "I glorify Jesus Christ, even God, who has given you such wisdom."

Not only is there found in these Fathers this clear identification of Christ with God, but there are expressions also which seem to have been dictated by a distinct conception of the doc-

Digitized by Google

trine of the Trinity. Clement of Rome asks, "Have we not one God and one Christ? Is there not one Spirit of grace?" (c. 46.) Polycarp, it seems, closed his prayer at the stake with this ascription: "For this, and for all things, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee together with the eternal and heavenly Jesus, thy beloved Son, with whom to thee and the Holy Spirit be glory, both now and to all succeeding ages." See Letter to Smyrna, c. 14. Ignatius to the Magnesians (c. 13) says, "Study, that whatsoever ye do, ye may prosper both in body and spirit, in faith and charity, in the Son and in the Father and in the Holy Spirit." Here the Son is named first, but all three are distinctively named.

Barnabas (Ep. ch. 5) finds an allusion to the same doctrine in the Mosaic account of the creation of man. His language is, "For this cause the Lord endured to suffer for our souls, although he was Lord of the whole earth, to whom he [the Father] said before the making of the world, 'Let us make man after our own image and likeness.'" Still, while it is very clear that this view was held, and is involved in these expressions, it was not brought out in dogmatic fullness, or under scientific explanation, till controversy pressed the truth into clearer and fuller statements.

Of course it would behoove those who advocated this doctrine to attempt to find it in the foreshadowings of the Old Testament. Accordingly the various manifestations of God to the patriarchs and prophets under the old dispensation, were manifestations of the Son or Logos, not of the Father. Justin Martyr (A. D. 163) says, It was the Son or Logos that appeared to Moses in the burning bush. This being, who then announced himself as the "I am," is the same who afterwards became flesh. His words are, commenting on the words of the angel, "These words were spoken to demonstrate the Son of God and Apostle, to be our Jesus Christ, who is the very pre-existing Logos; who appeared sometimes in the form of fire, sometimes in the likeness of angels, and in these last days was made man by the will of God, for the salvation of mankind, and was contented to suffer what the devils could inflict on him by the infatuated Jews; who, notwithstanding they have these express words in the writings of Moses: 'And the angel of the Lord spake with Moses in a flame of fire out of the bush, and said, I am that I am, the self-existent, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob;' notwithstanding this, I say, they affirm these words to be spoken by God the Fa-

Digitized by Google

ther and Maker of all things. For which oversight the prophetic Spirit thus charges them: 'Israel hath not known me, my people have not understood me;' and as I have said, Jesus taxed them again for the same thing, while he was among them. 'No man hath known the Father, but the Son; nor the Son, but those to whom the Son will reveal him.' The Jews, therefore, for maintaining that it was the Father of the Universe who had the conference with Moses, when it was the very Son of God who had it, and who is styled both angel and apostle (Heb. iii. 1), are justly accused by the prophetic Spirit, and Christ himself, for knowing neither the Father nor the Son; for they who affirm the Son to be the Father, are guilty of not knowing that the Father of the Universe has a Son, who, being the Logos and first begotten of God, is God. And he it is who, heretofore, appeared to Moses and the rest of the prophets, sometimes in fire, and sometimes in the form of angels; but now, under your empire, as I mentioned, was born of a virgin, according to the will of his Father, to save such as believe in him."

As to the nature of the Logos thus manifesting God, Justin is equally clear in his discriminations. He says, "God, in the beginning, before all creation (προ παντων των κτισματων), begat from himself a certain rational power (γεγεννηκε δυναμιν τινα εξ εαυτου λογικην), who is called by the Holy Spirit, the glory of the Lord, sometimes the Son, sometimes the Wisdom." "This rational Power was generated from the Father by his energy and will, yet without any abscission or division of the essence of the Father." Here was the doctrine of eternal generation, as in distinction from the doctrine of a creation *de nihilo*, because that which was εξ εαυτου, "from himself," could not be *de nihilo*, "from nothing." *They are one in essence.*

They are also distinct in Personality. This rational power he says, is not merely, like the light of the sun, nominaly different, but really another numerically, (ἑτερον τι)—not a mere effluence, but a subsistence.

Julian also asserts the pre-existence and eternity of the Logos, whom, be it remembered, he identifies with the Son. "The Son of the Father," says he, "even he, who is properly called his Son, the Word, was with him, and begotten of him before the creation (προ των ποιηματων), because he in the beginning made and disposed all things."

Digitized by Google

Clement of Alexandria (220) asserts unity of *essence*. "The two are one, namely God," says he. And again, He is "the divine word, who is most manifestly true God (*ὄντως θεός*), who is *equalized* (*ἰσωθείς*) with the Lord of the universe, because he was his Son, and was the word of God;" and in other passages.

He also asserts plainly the trinity of the Godhead. "There is one Father of the universe; there is also one Word of the universe; and one Holy Spirit, who is everywhere."

Tertullian (220) exerted much influence in the development of the doctrine of the Trinity. He was a Latin father of the third century. He exerted himself polemically against the Patripassians, who, while they contended for the unity of essence, denied the true personality of the Son and Holy Spirit. Tertullian contended for three distinct personalities, and is the author of the term *Trinitas* (Trinity). He was the first to introduce it, as Theophilus was the first to introduce the corresponding Greek word Triad (*τριας*).

Tertullian argued for the distinction of person thus: "I assert that there are *two*—God and his Word, the Father and his son. For the root and the trunk are two things, but conjoined; and the fountain and the tree are two phenomenal appearances (*species*), but undivided; and the sun and ray are two forms (*formæ*), but coherent. Every thing that issues from another thing (*prodit ex aliquo*) is a second thing in relation to that from which it issues; but it is not for that reason separate from it. But where there is a second thing there are two things, and where there is a third thing, there are three things. For the third is the Spirit from God and the Son; as the fruit from the trunk is third from the root, and the canal (*rivus*) from the stream is third from the fountain; and the scintillation (*apex*) from the ray is third from the sun. Nevertheless nothing becomes foreign from the source whence it derives its properties. In like manner the trinity (*trinitas*) flowing down (*decurrens*) from the Father, through continuous and connected gradations, interferes not with the divine monarchy, and preserves the status of the divine economy (*monarchiæ nihil obstrepit et οἰκονομίας statum protegit*). I say that the Father is one, the Son is another, and the Spirit another. Nevertheless, the Son is not another than the Father by diversity (of essence), but by distribution (of essence); not another by division (of essence), but by distinction (of essence); because the Father

Digitized by Google

and Son are not one and the same (person), but one differs from the other in a certain special manner *(modulo)*."

The contribution of Tertullian to this great doctrine is not so much in the soundness of his illustrations, for they are only a mode of saying what he thought—by no means such an analogy as helps to establish upon a rational basis the doctrine itself—but Tertullian taught with all the emphasis of his ardent nature, the unqualified *essential* trinity of the Godhead, and thus exerted, as Dorner says, "an important influence upon the subsequent development of the doctrine."

Irenæus (202) affirms the eternal pre-existence of the Son thus: "Having shown that the word who existed in the beginning with God, by whom all things were made, and who was always present to the human race, has in these last times become a patible man, ... the objection is excluded of those who say, 'If Christ was born at that time, then before that time He did not exist.' For we have shown that because he always existed with the Father, he did not at that time begin to be the Son of God.....Wherefore in the beginning, God formed Adam, not as though God needed man, but that he might have one upon whom he could bestow benefits. For not only before Adam, but before all creation *(ante omnem conditionem)*, the Word was glorifying his Father, being immanent *(manens)* in him; and he himself was glorified by the Father, as he himself says: 'Father, glorify thou me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.'....The Jews departed from God because they did not receive his Word, but supposed that they could know the Father alone by himself, without his Word, that is his Son; not knowing God who spoke in a visible form *(figuro)* to Abraham, and again to Moses, saying, 'I have seen the affliction of my people in Egypt, and have come down to visit thee."

Again he says: "There is one God, the Father, in all and through all, and one Word and one Son and one Spirit, and one salvation to all who believe in Him."

Similar doctrine is taught by others, but we need not quote farther. We may sum up the teachings of the Ante-Nicene Fathers in the words of Waterland: "1. They employed the word God in the strict sense of signifying the divine *substance*, and applied it to the Son in this sense. 2. They admitted but one substance to be strictly Divine, and rejected with abhorrence the notion of

Digitized by Google

inferior and secondary divinities. 3. They confined worship to the one true God, and yet worshiped the Son. 4. They attributed eternity, omnipotence and uncreatedness to the Son, and held him to be the creator and preserver of the universe. 5. Had the ante-Nicene Fathers held that the Son was different from the Father, with respect to substance, eternity, omnipotence, uncreatedness, &c., they would certainly have specified this difference in the Sabellian controversy; for this would have proved beyond all dispute that the Son and Father are not one Person or Hypostasis. But they never did."—Waterland. First Defense, Query xxv.

Among the great speculatists who took up this subject where Tertullian and Iræneus had left it, was Origen. He was a scholar of vast learning, an abstract thinker of the subtlest class, a dialectician of rare ingenuity, and plausible to a fault. His desire to bring all students and expounders of divine truth to one opinion, led him sometimes so to accommodate his statements of opposing truths, as to lead both parties in this great controversy to claim him, if not as dogmatically asserting their views, at least as holding general principles which involved them. (A. D. 220-50.)

The special end to which Origen turned his splendid abilities was to defend the doctrine of the trinity against Monarchianism, or Patripassianism. He aimed to show that the Son was as truly a hypostasis as the Father—that the personal pronoun could be as properly applied to the one as to the other. He more sharply distinguished and defended the doctrine of "three hypostases," than it had ever been done before. As Tertullian had been the first to introduce the word trinity, and Theophilus the word triad, so Origen in turn inserts and employs this new term, *hypostasis*, and states his doctrine of the trinity under the expression, "three hypostases." He meant by it three real personal subsistences, He rejected all idea of the Son or the Holy Spirit being mere vague effluences or influences—like a universal reason, or a holy spirit dwelling in a man, yet having no distinct and real personality,—and maintained with emphasis the trinal distinction of the Godhead into three persons.

But we shall let him explain himself. He says it is necessary to distinguish between ὁ and θεὸς. The Father alone is ὁ θεός;—the Son is θεός. The Son is not God in the primary sense. Therefore John omits the article when he says the word was God (θεός,

Digitized by Google

not ὁ θεος). The Logos does not share in the self-subsistent substance of the deity. He cannot therefore be called consubstantial (ὁμοουσιος) with the Father. He is God only by the communication of a *secondary* grade or species of divinity. The eternal generation does not communicate the primary, absolute, eternal essence of the Father to the Second Person. He is another and a subordinate to the Father. God, the Father of the Truth, is greater than the truth itself; and God, the Father of wisdom, is greater than wisdom itself.

Nor was this subordination one of order and relationship merely—it was one of *essence*. Αυτοθεος is God per se, God with the article. Wherefore our Savior says, 'that they may know thee, the only true God.' But whatsoever is deified (*deificatum*) over and beside him who is denominated αυτοθεος, or God *per se*, by a participation and communion of that divinity, is not to be denominated God with the article, but more properly God without the article; which latter designation belongs to the First-Begotten of every creature, because inasmuch as he first attracted divinity to himself, he is more honorable than the other gods who exist besides himself. We believe the Savior himself when he says, "My Father is greater than I." "We plainly teach that the son of the creator, who formed this sensible world, is not mightier than the Father, but inferior;" and much more to the same import.

Yet Origin did not hold that Christ was a *creature*. He contends against Celsus that the Second Person in the Trinity is not to be ranked with the γενητα, or created existences, but he is an existence midway between that of the Uncreated and that of all creatures." Higher than all orders of creatures, even than those higher ranks of spirits, who by their exaltation above the limits of finite existences are fitted for communion with God, and in a peculiar sense therefore divine—or gods. The Son derives his (secondary) divinity immediately from God; all other existences receive theirs mediately through the Son, to whom the Father has given to have life *in himself*, and who, therefore, is capable of creating. The Father is the first ground and cause of all things, yet the Logos is the creator of the universe in virtue of the *life in himself* derived from the Father.

Two defects have been demonstrated in this system of Origen:

1. He maintains two species of divinity—an ὁ θεος and a θεος simply.

Digitized by Google

2. He contended that the generation of Christ or the Second Person in the hypostasis, proceeds from the *will of the Father*.

1. The first position, that of two species, amounts to a kind of polytheism. That Origen did not intend this is plain. Yet if his position logically involves this, it matters not, so far as the value of the system is concerned, whether he saw it or not. Godhead is a thing of degrees. God the Father has it in a higher grade than the Logos, and the Logos, in turn, in a higher grade than the whole ranks of descending creations, that make up the heavenly hierarchies. Philosophically, in its last analysis, this system does not differ from the Pagan emanation-scheme.

2. In contending that the generation of the Second Person proceeds from the will of the Father, the nature of the Son is made contingent. The Father is a monad, the God in its absolute and original unity—in respect to which the second and third hypostases have only a relative existence. It is but historic justice to say, that many contend that Origen did not really hold that the Son proceeds in his generation from the will of the Father, in the sense of making him a contingent being of mere relative existence, but we have neither time nor inclination to discuss the merits of the dispute. We may accept with safety the summary of Baur as to Origen's Trinitarianism.

He says: 1. Origen starts with the fact of difference between the Father and Son; in other words, from the hypostatical character.

2. This difference is marked by the apostle John in the first verse of his gospel, by the use of the article when the unbegotten is meant, and its omission when the begotten is signified.

3. This difference implies the subordination of the Son to the Father, as to essence; for though he calls the Son αυτοσοφια, ουτοαληθεια, etc., he will not call him αυτοθεος; he interprets Matt. xix. 6 (good master) to mean that only God in the absolute sense, and not God the Son, is "good;" and holds that the sphere in which the Son acts is second to that in which the Father acts, and that of the Holy Spirit is second to that of the Son,—the Father's sphere being all-comprehending, including those of the Son and the Spirit, the Son's comprehensive only of creation, and the Holy Spirit's agency being limited to the minds of the holy.

4. Origen reduces the triplicity to a unity, not by means of unity of essence, but of moral harmony of will.—(Baur, Dreieinigkeitslehre, I. 107.)

Digitized by Google

It is evident that this illustrious man vacillated at times in his wrestlings with this great problem—that he could not see how *sameness of essence* (ὁμοούσιος) could be in logical consistency with hypostatical distinctions in the deity, and that this seeming incompatibility led him, of the two views, to affirm the latter (personal distinctions) and deny the former (consubstantiality). Let it be remembered, however, always to his honor, that this was a scientific difficulty with Origen, and no desire to depreciate the Son. In subordinating the Son to the Father, he still held him high above all other existences, teaching that "all prayer and supplication, and intercession and thanksgiving are to be sent up to the God over all, by the High Priest, who is above all angels, being the living Word, and God. And, that we may also offer supplications to the Word himself, and intercession, and thanksgiving, and prayer." But this, perhaps, only that he may as intercessor bring them to the Father. In the language of Neander, "Christ was, to Origen, still the way, the truth and the life.....He knew of no other way to the Father; no other source of truth; no other spring of divine life for all creatures, but him: he was the mirror, through which Paul and Peter, and all who were like them, saw God. Until the Father was revealed by Christ, men could have no other knowledge of God than as the Creator and Lord of the world, since it was first through the Son they came to the knowledge of him as their Father; and it was by the Spirit of adoption which they received from him, they were first enabled to address God as their Father. He recognized him as the mediator from whom alone Christians derive their communion with God; to whom they should constantly refer their Christian consciousness, and in whose name and through whom they should always pray to God the Father." (Ch. Hist. Vol. I. 591.) W. K. P.

If a man be endued with a generous mind, this is the best kind of nobility.—PLATO.

Time, with all his celerity, moves slowly on to him whose whole employment is to watch its flight.—JOHNSON.

Economy is the parent of integrity, of liberty, and of ease; and the beauteous sister of temperance, of cheerfulness, and health.

Digitized by Google

WHY DID I LEAVE THE "M. E. CHURCH" AND JOIN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH?

BY PROF. J. A. REUBELT.

Having been expelled from the M. E. Church by a resolution of the Judiciary Committee of Indiana Conference, at the meetting of said Conference at Bloomington, Indiana, in September last, I may be charged with presumption by some for speaking of leaving said church. To all such I will merely say, that the history of my trial and expulsion, with all the documents relating thereto, and with the written opinions of prominent laymen on my sentence, etc., will soon be published in pamphlet, so that every one that takes an interest, not so much in my treatment as in the action of an authorized body of a powerful denomination of the country, can pass an independent judgment on the case. I had, moreover, the right of appeal to General Conference, which meets in May 1872, left, so that I can at least qualifiedly speak of my leaving the M. E. Church. Having arrived at such a period in life, when a man's views on religion and other important subjects are generally considered settled and permanent, the public, and the brotherhood more particularly, have an unmistakable right to inquire of me into the reasons of my step. Looking upon the subject in this light, I shall now proceed to state my reasons for doing so, briefly.

First of all, I would say, that my step did not proceed from a sudden radical change of views, nor was it brought about by the treatment I received at the hands of the "judiciary committee." This treatment may have hastened the step for a short time, but more it certainly did not. Ever since I have been acquainted with the views and practices of the Christian church, I have, in the main, approved and liked them. A noted church historian of the country had, by his published remarks, prejudiced me against the "Christians"—but when I became intimately acquainted with the President (Wm. F. Black) of the N. W. Christian University, who was for four years my pupil in every language he knows except English and Syriac, my prejudices vanished; and when I read the *Christian Standard*, which he furnished me, I found therein my own views. I soon commenced corre-

Digitized by Google

sponding with brother Errett, and by invitation, wrote for his paper;—let it suffice to state here that the series of essays on Eschatology, that appeared a number of years ago in that excellent paper, was from my pen; the series on Inspiration, that appeared subsequently, was likewise written by me, and so were the "Views of the Reformation by a Friendly Outsider," that appeared last winter in the *Standard*. Besides these series, I published many separate articles. I have also written for the *Christian Quarterly*, and whoever will take the trouble to examine my essay on Development, published in the April number of that periodical, will understand at once why I left the Methodist and joined the Christian church.

Now to go into particulars:—Ever since I have had a developed Christian self-consciousness, the Bible alone has been my creed, my only rule of faith and practice, and I have often said, ten or fifteen years ago, that there was no written confession of faith or creed in existence that I could unqualifiedly subscribe. I believe it is the sacred duty of all believers to grow as well in the knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ, as in grace. This, however, is materially impeded, if not altogether prevented, by creeds and confessions of faith, if they have normative authority ascribed to them. I do not feel called upon to develop and prove this proposition here; moreover it appears to me almost as self-evident, needing no proof. If I am bound by my creed to believe in unconditional election and reprobation, I must read my Bible with a view to find this docrine there; the same is the case if my creed is Arminian, and so on. As a German by birth and thought, I have some respect for scientific theology, or the science of theology. A creed-bound church can have no scientific theology, as her works must be one-sided and apologetic. This objection holds good, of course, not with regard to Methodism alone, but to all creed-bound denominations of the country. When a man now-a-days writes a theological work in this country, rarely as this happens, it is *stereotyped*, and all change in subsequent editions is excluded, a phenomenon that is never met with in Germany. There an author introduces changes in every new edition, and does not blush at confessing that he was wrong in the earlier editions. As creed-bound churches cannot healthfully advance in a better understanding of the Bible, so they cannot make any advance toward a final union. The points of difference in their

Digitized by Google

creeds are impassable gulfs fixed between them, and the best they can do, is to agree to disagree. Moreover, not only the Bible is differently intrpreted by men, but also the different creeds by their respective followers. It is well known, that the construction put by Roman Catholic divines on the decrees of the council of Trent, embodies radical differences;—the same is also the case already with the decrees of the council of 1870. A different construction put on the Standards of the Presbyterian church, led to the split into the Old and the New School, and time only can show whether their recent union was a blessing or a curse.

This creed-system is anti-Protestant as well as anti-scriptural, doing violence to the God-given right of private judgment and liberty of conscience, while the union it effects is altogether mechanical. No intelligent reader of the New Testament can fail to perceive, that the leading apostles, inspired as they were, had their peculiar conceptions of Christianity, and it is by no means an idle talk to speak of a Pauline, a Petrine, a Johannean and a Jacobine type of Christianity. Differences of opinion are, therefore, perfectly consistent with unity of faith and Christian fellowship. Hence that church is necessarily my church, that has the Bible alone for its creed.

But this truth does not stand isolated. It cannot escape the notice of any close observer, that even those denominations that date from the 16th century and hold to the confessions of faith framed then, have evidently departed from the spirit of these in many respects venerable documents. In all of them, with the exception of those of a Socinian and, afterwards, of an Arminian origin, the objective side of both Word and Sacraments is recognized and emphasized; in our days it is virtually denied by all. The Holy Spirit is no longer supposed to work *with* and *through* the word and sacraments, but independently of both, and thus an unscriptural spiritualism is created, that opens the flood-gates of all kinds of delusions and fanaticism. In the Methodist church this spiritualism has found, perhaps, the fullest development and widest application;—its practical workings can be seen in every protracted meeting and revival occasion, that remind the beholder of anything rather than a Bible scene. It is in the Christian church, where I find the Holy Spirit believed to work through and with the word and the sacraments, as the Bible teaches.—While Mr. Wesley measurably revived the much neglected doc-

Digitized by Google

trine of the witness of the Spirit, his followers, if not Wesley himself, perverted this precious doctrine outrageously. This precious boon can, from the nature of the case, not be enjoyed uninterruptedly, and follows faith, as well as good works do. But in Methodist conversions it is made the test of conversion, and the believer remains a "seeker" until he has this witness, a practice that is not only foreign, but diametrically opposed to the letter and spirit of the Bible, and courts and legalizes all forms of the wildest fanaticism. It is true, in the more intelligent Methdist churches there is a change for the better on this point, some discountenancing even protracted meetings, but it is rather held, that the genuine spirit of Methodism favors the views and practices in question, and the preachers and congregations alluded to will either return to their first love, or leave the Methodist church altogether.

But what drove me mainly out of the Methodist church, as far as I could be driven out, and what ought to be a subject of alarm for every friend of civil and religious liberty, is the highly developed *hierarchical character* and compact ecclesiasticism of the M. E. church. Its very name, "Methodist Episcopal Church," indicates this feature, and is perfectly truthful. Methodism does not claim to be Protestant, and really is not. Protestantism is not only a protest against the one or the other papal doctrine, but primarily against all spiritual dogmatism, a loud vindication of the rights of private judgment and liberty of conscience. These rights Methodism neither recognizes nor tolerates. This may sound strange, and bring upon my head denunciations grievous and many—but I speak deliberately, and shall soon discuss this subject more fully in another place. I repeat here, the spirit of Methodism is as hierarchical and as much opposed to indvidual freedom and independence of research as the spirit of popery, and I maintain, without the least fear of successful contradiction, that to-day there is infinitely more real freedom in the Roman Catholic church of Germany, than in the M. E. church of America. Whoever doubts the truth of this assertion, can easily satisfy his mind about it by carefully reading the periodical literature and theological and philosopical writings of the two denominational bodies. It is true, the Methodist church has not yet burnt heretics and it is charitably supposed that the Roman Catholic church would also do it no more. But how does she, the M. E.

Digitized by Google

church, treat in this respect her members and preachers? It is well known, that so far the laity has scarcely had anything to say in the government of the church;—the books the members are to read, and the periodical literature, are furnished by the church, and the editors of these books and Advocates have no more independence of mind than Jesuit ever had. They have to advocate Methodist doctrine and Methodist practice. They have to take side with the organism in the event of any difficulty, or their heads fall at the next General Conference, if not before, by the Book Committee. The young preacher is for four years almost entirely dependent on his Presiding Elder, and wo be to him, if he manifests the least sign of independence of mind in thought or practice. When he leaves the apprentice's shoes, provided he has any talent, he casts about for lucrative positions, and observation tells him that it is for him sound policy to eschew all independence and to walk in the beaten track. "Are our bishops men?" was a year or two ago asked by the editor of some Advocate, and the same question may with equal propriety be asked with regard to any Methodist preacher that holds an independent position in the church, or is a candidate for such a position.

How deeply rooted the opposition to theological training in Methodism is, appears from the reluctance with which theological schools have been established, and with how little favor they met from the church at large. Their institutions of the kind are of quite recent date, and are the work of individuals, not of the church as such—presiding elders generally, if not uniformly, discouraging young men from going to theological seminaries, fearing greatly that a young man of theological training will be a far less pliable tool than one without it. "We have now theological schools, and it is to be seen whether we shall soon have also schools of theology," said Dr. Curry in his Advocate significantly some time ago. Since the establishment of theological schools could not be prevented any longer, all diligence must be used to convert them into mechanical apparatuses, where the pupil learns a greater or smaller number of doctrines, etc., but is carefully guarded against the exercise of any independence.

Again, the discipline of the M. E. church does not even claim to be founded on the Word of God, or to have the same ends in view which the New Testament teaches. Its exercise is virtually in the hands of the preacher, and under certain circumstances a

Digitized by Google

member or preacher, no matter how innocent he may be, can be crushed by means of this powerful machinery. Proof of this I am myself, having been expelled from the M. E. Church, not for what I had done, but for what an irresponsible person said before the Committee in my absence, that I would do. This feature of Methodist discipline is universally known. During our late rebellion the Northern Methodists were unionists, while the Southern Methodists were secessionists;—the spirit of Methodism, therefore, did not beget and nurture either unionism or secessionism, but the tyrannical majority in either section of the country crushed out all dissent, and the democratic Methodist in the North had to leave his church, while the unionistic Methodist of the South saw something worse for himself in store. In this trait of Methodism lies, in my opinion, the danger for our civil and religious liberty; individual independence is crushed out by it, and the member becomes a mere tool, a mere part of the machinery.

These are some of my reasons for wishing to remain forever outside of the M. E. church, and for uniting with the Christian church, where individual liberty is sacredly guarded and every vestige of ecclesiasticism trampled under foot.

BLOOMINGTON, IND., Nov. 5, 1870.

REMARKS ON L.'S "PLEA FOR UNION."

DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—Though the spirit of our age will necessarily draw many into its own channel, to the ignoring of the fundamental principles of truth and right, I was unprepared to see in the columns of a periodical devoted to the advocacy of Primitive Christianity, and by a writer who claims to be identified with its cause, such a plea as that of your correspondent 'L.,' in the September issue of the Harbinger. *

What are *we* and what is *our body* that we should be classed

* The article referred to was not published because it expressed my own sentiments, but in the spirit of free discussion to which the Harbinger has ever been committed. We expected it to provoke a reply, and now we give 'J. L.' *versus* 'L.,' in the hope that it may turn our thoughts to union. W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

with the denominations around us, bound and fettered as they are by humanly constructed creeds, and rules of post-apostolic origin and too often of anti-apostolic tendency? What are *our conditions* which must be discarded in order to an union of all Christians into one body? If *we* as a body cannot prove our identity with the Christian church of apostolic days; if *we* originated l . after this, as 'L.' charges; and if *our conditions* are not the law of the *New* (Christian) *Institution* delivered by the Holy Spirit through inspired men, then let us hasten to shuffle off the unchristian coil, immolate it on the funereal pyre, and having consumed the unholy form, let us henceforth seek a purer, a higher and a more Christ-like existence.

But if we disclaim and discard all mere human authority, if our creed is the testimony of the Spirit of God concerning the Messiah; if we claim Him as our sole Savior, Teacher and Lawgiver; if we rejoice in His blood as the only Divinely-sanctioned propitiation for sins, and His ordinances and example as our perfect rule of life; if the ruling desire of our grateful hearts is to know what the Lord would have us to do; if we are ready at all times to repudiate all that is shown to be merely human, and to accept all that is Divine, then *we* are in no sense a *denominaiion* or *sect*, —a division from nor in the Body of Christ,—but the glorious body itself, ruled and directed by its Divine Head. For us to decide which of the *conditions* enjoined in the New Testament are to be set aside and which are to be binding, is to seek to depose the Lord of the universe and to assume his powers and authority.

'L.' thinks that "the eyes of our denominational brethren have been so long in darkness, that it will take them some time to accustom them to the light," and that we should work with them, in full fellowship, until their eyes are opened. If he recognizes such bodies as the church of Christ, how can he justify his breaking off from them to form a new sect? If in place of thus making himself *an heretic* he decides to seek fellowship in some one denomination, he merely "hides his light under a bushel," and condemns himself to sit from year's end to year's end listening to the declamations of the preacher on *total depravity, predestination, the Word of God a dead letter, the Spirit's agency in conversion*, and kindred lifeless topics and subjects; to see the Lord's ordinances neglected or repudiated, His worship caricatured by an operatic performance by an instrument and choir, without the

Digitized by Google

movement of a lip or the slightest appearance of interest among the members of the church, and all this almost without the possibility of enlightening their minds. If his spirit is stirred within him, and he seeks to bring forth the light of God's testimony to illumine their darkness, he is branded as a meddling, unruly and dangerous person, and if he persists, is cast out as a heretic. And if all religious bodies could be persuaded to unite, in how many places would we be numerically so great as to control the doctrine?

Were the assertion of 'L.' correct, that we are all agreed "in the great and distinguishing characteristics—faith, repentance, baptism, Lord's Supper, prayer, assembling ourselves together, and Christlike conduct," our protesting stand would be condemnable; but what are the facts of the case? Nearly all reject the plan of the New Covenant—Heb. viii. 10: "This is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put my laws into their minds and write them in their hearts, and I will be to them a God and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his brother and every man his neighbor, saying, Know the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness and their sins and iniquities I will remember no more." In place of building up the church of believing, living, faithful members, they introduce infant members incapable of faith, instruction or knowledge of God; they break down the barrier between the church and the world, and reduce it to a nondescript community entered like the Jewish nation by a fleshly birth. In place of the 'one baptism' of the Scriptures, they practice several substitutes or nothing. The Lord's Supper is not attended to when the disciples come together on the first of the week, but quarterly or yearly, as their human laws enjoin. The difference, says 'L.,' is not "so radical as that between the Jewish Christians and the Gentile Christians." Yet what was the decision of the Holy Spirit through the disciples elders at Jerusalem? A complete condemnation of the Jewish imposition. What says Paul to the Gentile Christians of Galatia? "Behold, Paul say unto you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." For what purpose did the apostle pen his epistle to the Hebrews? To show that the types and shadows of the Jewish Law had been fulfilled in the great Antitype, and that though

Digitized by Google

they might retain the marks of their fleshly descent ese had now no place in the new and spiritual administration.—When the over-zealous Jerusalem brethren desired to have Titus circumcised, Paul "gave them place, no not for one hour." But, says 'L.,' we should "ignore for the time the difference in our interpretations of God's commands, that they may in time *themselves* see their errors and correct them." This is a convenient doctrine for those who are at ease in Zion, who delight to cry peace, peace, when there is no peace, but we fail to recognize it in Paul, who in the matter of the Judaisms referred to by 'L.,' "withstood (Peter) to the face." It ill accords with the lives of the great reformers who have contributed to purge Christianity of its pollulutions, and to restore to us something of its original purity and power. Need I name Wickliff, Luther, Melanchthon, Knox, Wesley, or Campbell? What would have been the result of their labors had they agreed to differ, and kept back the light until their deluded brethren *themselves* came to see and correct their errors?

'L.' truly says that honest 'intention" and "desire" are as acceptable with God as the actual fulfillment of the "intention" or "desire." But this does not imply what he proceeds to assert—that our honest intention to do what we *erroneously* think to be right is equally commendable in God's sight with the doing of what *is* right. Such was not the conclusion of Paul concerning his *honest* persecution of the Christians. "To me who *am the chief of sinners* is this grace given, to preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ." Such was not the experience of Uzza, who *honestly* put forth his hand to steady the ark. Such was not the teaching of our Savior, when he said, "He that knew his master's will and did it not shall be beaten with many stripes, but he that knew it not and failed to obey shall be beaten with few stripes."

Again, 'L.' will accept to full communion "every one who will confess Jesus as the Son of the living God," "leaving him to find his duty from God's word, and to obey or disobey at his peril." But he specially proscribes the Unitarian, no matter how honest his professions and how blameless his life. Has he considered that his system will accept the Shaker, the free-love communist, the Mormon, and even the Mahometan?—But I forbear.

Digitized by Google

May God strengthen his servants to be valiant for the *truth*. May they all strive to hold fast the ordinances as they were delivered, and may they still more highly exalt the authoriy of that Lord who has become the Author of eternal salvation to all them that *obey* him.——Your brother in Christ, J. L.

REVISION OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.

Our readers are aware that a body of learned scholars and divines of the Church of England, called together by authority, have been revising the common version of the Holy Scriptures. The following paragraph from the *N. Y. Evening Post*, reports alterations in the common rendering of the Lord's prayer, in Matt. vi.:

"AN ALTERATION OF THE LORD'S PRAYER.—A few years ago nothing would have seemed more improbable than the deliberate alteration, by an authoritative body of Christian clergymen and orthodox Biblical scholars, of the phraseology and meaning of the Lord's Prayer, yet such has been the case. The New Testament revisionists, now in session in London, have voted that the literal translation of the phrase, 'deliver us from evil,' should be, 'deliver us from the evil one;' and they have decided to expunge the doxology at the end of the prayer, as absent from all the earlier manuscripts. Thus shorn and altered, the great prayer of the ages will sound unfamiliar indeed."

First, we remark, that it is strange how long prejudice holds sway over the minds of men; of this the above paragraph, though in a somewhat moderate manifestation, is an illustration. We cling with great affection and devotion to that which is old and venerable with us and our fathers. This is something quite natural to the human heart,—something from which we do not like to be divorced, and which we do not yield up without a struggle, and often much pain. And what is more venerated by us, in the religious habit of our lives, from the earliest childhood up, than this prayer, which the Lord taught his disciples to pray, which *we* were taught in our tenderest infancy, which we have heard so often amid the impressive solemnities of the worship of the sanctuary, and which devout Christians of all lands and throughout

Digitized by Google

the long Christian ages, have devoutly repeated? It is right that this prayer should be cherished with pious devotion.

And what is there in this great prayer that has impressed us more, and that we are more familiar with, than the doxology, that concludes it so grandly? To hear, then, that this doxology is to be omitted from it, and that it is no part, really, of the Lord's prayer as he taught it himself, will be startling and painful news to many. Here now is a fair test between prepossession and truth.

But first, with reference to the expression, "deliver us from evil," which these eminent, orthodox Church of England revisers now render, "—from the evil one"—that is, from *Satan.* The original for 'evil' is τοῦ πονηροῦ, which may be the genitive either of ὁ πονηρός, the masculine form, denoting "the evil one," i. e., Satan, or of τὸ πονηρόν, the neuter form, denoting the evil in principle and development in the world, that is, sin.

The adjective πονηρός *(poneros)* is the strongest of the words used in the New Testament denoting bad, or evil. Its signification is, *wicke* in it "the positive activity of evil is more decidedly expressed" than in the other words of a similar meaning.* Hence it is often applied to Satan, "the wicked one," as Matt. 13:19, 38; Eph. 6:16; I Jno. 2:13, 14; 3:12; 5:18; and to the incestuous person, 1 Cor. 5:13, here translated, "that *wicked* person." In the Lord's Prayer the article is used with it, evidently here to give it a defin te sense,—so that it should be rendered, 'the wicked' or 'evil' in principle and action, or 'the wicked' or 'evil' one—that is, Satan. "Deliver us from evil" simply, does not repeat in English the fullness of the original, as any one familiar with the Greek cannot but feel; "from evil" is too indefinite.

The controversy, we think, must turn in favor of the correctness of the rendering adopted by the London revisers. The reasons in support of it are ready at hand, and are strong. We may give them thus:

1. The expression ὁ πονηρός, "the wicked one," is repeatedly applied in the New Testament definitely to Satan,—as in the passages above cited.

2. The first part of the petition is, "Lead us not into tempta-

* Trench—Greek Syn. of the N. T. Second Part, p. 169

Digitized by Google

tion;" then follows, "*but deliver us* from the evil one." Now Satan is, by way of eminence, called 'the tempter' (*ὁ πειράζων*), and so represented in the Old and New Testaments. The whole petition therefore is one in import,—a petition not to be delivered unto, but to be rescued from, "the tempter," "the wicked one." This brings together and harmonizes both members of the petition.

3. There is a peculiar force in the word *ῥῦσαι ἡμας*—"*deliver* us." This word signifies 'to rescue,' 'to tear away from,' 'to free from,' as from the tyranny of Satan, and the chains with which he binds men.

4. It was in the prayers of the Jews, to pray to be delivered '*from Satan, the destroyer*,' (the term destroyer is given to him from the Hebrew in the New Testament, Rev. 9: 11,—Hebrew *Abaddon*, Greek *Apollyon*, that is, destroyer.)

5. Christ, in his prayer for his disciples, Jno. 17: 15, uses the same word,—"I pray not that thou shouldst take them out of the world, but that thou shouldst preserve them from the evil one"—*ἐκ του πονηρου*. Here it is evidently to be understood as referring to Satan. The devil had "entered" into Judas Iscariot; this one Jesus had thus lost; he prayed that the others might be saved, preserved, from his power. This prayer of Christ becomes very clear and receives great force when studied in the light of the apostle John's words, 1 Jno. 5: 19, "We know that we are of God, and that the whole world lies under the dominion of the evil one,"—properly so translated, rather than, "in wickedness." The expression is *ἐν τῳ πονηρῳ*; hence he is called "the prince of this world," Jno. 12: 31, 14: 30, 16: 11. That Satan now is the ruler of this world,—has it under his dominion,—seems to be a prominent and often recurring thought with this apostle. Comparing now the passages just cited, and similar ones that abound in the New Testament, with Christ's prayer for his disciples, we are led to understand this prayer thus: that he prays, "not that God should take his disciples out of the world, but that he would preserve them from the evil one," that holds dominion over it.—Comp. Eph. 2: 2. Then studying the words of the Lord's prayer in the light of the results thus obtained, it becomes very clear to us that these words—*apo tou ponerou*—refer to Satan himself, as the personal embodiment and source of evil.

This translation may appear to be an innovation, but it is so

Digitized by Google

only on the usage of the common version and some other translations. The preponderance of general testimony is, we think, in favor of this 'innovation.' The ancients understood the word as signifying Satan; to this the exceptions are very few;—and in the modern ages, to our own day, the weight of the testimony has been in the same direction. Many of the chief commentators and expounders,—among these Bengel, Clarke, de Wette, Olshausen, Trench,—so give it. Among translations, a good number are on the same side. Among the older Protestant translators that did not follow the Vulgate, as so many did, but who drew from the fountain direct, the passage under question was generally applied to Satan. Beza, in his very fine Latin translation, gives it, 'ab illo malo,' and in Jno. 17: 15 'a Malo illo,—*from that evil one.*—Another Old Protestant Latin version gives the first, 'ab illo improbo,' the second, 'a maligno illo,'—both these Latin expressions signifying 'from that wicked one.' An old French Protestant version, and one in common use, renders the words in the Lord's prayer, '—du malin,' from the Wicked One; in the modern Greek New Testament it is απο τον πονηρον—the masculine, referring to Satan. Wakefield has it, 'from the Evil One;' so also Anderson; George Campbell and the Bible Union conform to the common version. We have but little doubt that what we regard the true translation of this passage, as now given by the London revisers, will finally prevail.

In interpretation, doubtless both the translations will substantially harmonize and meet in one. Yet, let us ever aim to reach, if possible, the exact truth, as the Word of God, as well as ourselves, will always gain by it; and above all things, let us ever be ready to yield even the most cherished prepossessions to truth, when this is clear to us. After all we have said, however, we would show all deference and respect to those whose intelligent convictions lead them to a different conclusion.

With reference to the rejection of the doxology from the Lord's Prayer,—we say that this is not a question of translation or interpretation, but simply one of text-criticism,—of manuscript authority;—that is, the only question is whether this doxology is really a part of the original text or not. This is now, happily, no longer difficult to decide.

We derive the original text of the Holy Scriptures from manuscript copies. The best of these manuscripts, for correctness and

Digitized by Google

reliability, are, of course, the most ancient ones. From the 8th century onward, manuscript copies of the New Testament were multiplied, but at the same time, errors, by the carelessness or ignorance of copyists, allowing sometimes glosses, or marginal notes, and interpolations to creep into the text, were also repeated and perpetuated. It has become, therefore, an object of great importance to secure the pure original text by freeing it from these corruptions, that had thus, age after age, crept into it. Hence the important science of *Textual Criticism*, by which this great end has been so well accomplished. This is done by comparing every letter, word and passage in the copies with the most ancient manuscripts, and the quotations as found in the earliest Christian writers,—especially the Greek. This science has been wonderfully successful, and has succeeded in giving the world an original text of the Scriptures, that may be accepted as pure and reliable. At the time, however, of the Protestant reformation, and during the succeeding century, when our present common translations in the various modern languages were made, this Textual Criticism was yet in its infancy, and some of the most valuable manuscripts were as yet either unknown, or but little accessible to scholarsor used by them. (See Tregelles, on the Printed Text of the New Testament,)

Textual criticism, with great unanimity, has long since decided against the genuineness of the 'doxology' to the Lord's prayer; it is not found in any of the ancient manuscripts, nor in the Vulgate Latin translation, that was made at a very early date, and therefore is not given in Catholic translations, that are made from the Vulgate. Indeed, there is now no controversy about the spuriousness of this passage, and as the question now stands, it is simply absurd to retain it in the text as a part of the inspired Scriptures. It stands precisely on a par with 1 Jno. 5: 7, which has also long ago been decided spurious. It would be altogether impossible for any respectable body of revisers to retain these in the text now. If any one wishes to use the ancient and very beautiful and appropriate words of this doxology in prayer, there can certainly be no objection; but to make them yet a part of the inspired text, is quite another thing. Dean Alford says: "The doxology must, on every ground of sound criticism, be omitted. Had it formed part of the original text, it is absolutely inconceivable that all the ancients should, with one consent, have omitted

Digitized by Google

it..... *We find absolutely no trace of it in early times* in any family of manuscripts, or in any expositors."

We append here the note on this passage in Granville Penn's valuable *Annotations to the Book of the New Covenant:**

"The ordinary conclusion of this verse, commonly called the '*doxology*,' is absent from this place, as from the parallel place in Luke (xi. 4), in the *Vatican*† and other ancient MSS. and versions. It is not in the Latin Vulgate, and consequently, it is not in Wiclif's translation [W. translated from the Vulgate—C. L. L.]. Our revisers have introduced it from Erasmus, to whom the modern *Constantinopolitan* texts only were known; for he says, 'This conclusion (of the prayer) I find in *all* the Greek copies:' these amounted, first to *four*, next to *five*, and lastly to *eight junior*‡ Manuscripts. But Erasmus subjoined this caution: 'Since it is not found in any manuscripts of the Latins, nor used by Jerome nor any expounder after him, except Chrysostom, and his later abbreviator, Theophylact, it seems to have been thus *added* from sacred usage in worship, as they have added some words to the *Angelic Salutation* (Luke 1: 28), that were neither spoken by the angel nor by any one else.' It is plain that it was only *a liturgical appendage* to the Lord's Prayer, in an ancient ritual of the Greek church, which has been obtruded on St. Matthew's text, to the disturbance of the intimate relation between the verses immediately preceding and following it."

It would certainly seem that, to-day, with enlightened, believing Christians of whatever name, who understand and rightly appreciate the difference between the *divine* and the *human*,—the Word of God and what is not the Word of God, there could be no possible question as to the propriety, nay the high, the imperative duty of correcting the versions of the Holy Scriptures from what are on all hands acknowledged to be, beyond all doubt, corruptions and errors, and of ceasing to hold up to mankind as the Word of God what is certainly known *not to be* the Word of God. But it is not so. To-day, in the afternoon of the nineteenth century, in the midst of all this superiority over the past, of light and

* London, 1837.

† And we now add,—and also from the latest known, and most valuable, because earliest, *Codex Sinaiticus*. C. L. L.

‡ Manuscripts of inferior date and value.

Digitized by Google

liberty, Christian men,—not the ignorant always, but often those of high culture in human and divine science,—use all their influence to resist, with the fervor of fear and trembling, the correction of ancient error. Ages pass away, yet how are men ever the same! In this very matter of the attempt to clear and save from corruption the Inspired Scriptures, this has eminently proved true. The controversy, in this respect, between light and darkness, freedom of mind and the bondage of prejudice, strength of faith and weakness of faith, has been going on for centuries, and for some men, enlightened men even, as yet to no profit; the end of it is not yet. There is also a large mass of *semi-obscure* light that hugs earnestly to its breast error, if it be only old and venerable, and *their* property. A fine specimen of this species of *clair-obscure* intelligences we find in the *N. Y. Evening Post;*—he speaks as follows:

"*To the Editors of the Evening Post:*—I regret to learn from a paragraph of last evening, that the distinguished clergymen of the English Church at present engaged in preparing a new translation of the Holy Scriptures, have voted that the literal translation of the phrase 'deliver us from evil' should be, 'deliver us from the evil *one.*' In avoiding one error they have surely fallen into another. *Apo tou poneron* literally means 'from the evil,' and doubtless the Divine Author of the prayer left the adjective *poneron* (evil) without an expressed noun, that it might apply to any thing or any being of an evil character. As to the rejection of the doxology at the close of the prayer, I am afraid the weight of authority is in their favor. I wish it were otherwise."

That is,—such men regret that Jesus taught the prayer in the form in which the Holy Spirit led him to give it; they "wish it were otherwise," and no doubt they wish God had done and spoken in many other things "otherwise" than he did. How can such people be consoled!

Such is prejudice! And yet, is not the opposition to purifying the versions on the part of men claiming the highest positions for learning and evangelical faith, of the same tenor? Do not these also "wish" that the corruptions now manifest were really original text, rather than that it "were otherwise," to save any and all disturbance of things as they are? Most evidently it is so!

So it was even in the very olden times. When Jerome made his Latin translation, or rather revision, what is now called the

Digitized by Google

Vulgate, contrary to his better knowledge he added to Daniel, by translation, some of the least valuable books of the Old Testament Apocrypha, *in deference to the prejudices of the ignorant*, as these works had been read so long that men had begun to esteem them with great religious veneration. He says: "Daniel, as received among the Hebrews, contains neither the History of Susannah, nor the Song of the Three Children, nor the Fable of Bel and the Dragon,—all of which, as they are dispersed *throughout the world* (italicising ours—C. L. L.), we have added, lest to the *ignorant* we should seem to have cut off part of the book, transfixing them, however, at the same time with a dagger and so slaying them (veru anteposito easque jugulante)." That is, he added them, contrary to his convictions of truth, and even marked them with a dagger to slay them, that is, to show that they were not canonical. On this act of Jerome, Erasmus says, "It is astonishing that what Jerome stabbed with a dagger is now everywhere read and sung in the churches; nay we read without any mark of distinction what Jerome did not fear to call a *fable*, —the history of Bel and the Dragon, and which he would not have added, had he not been apprehensive of seeming to cut off a considerable portion of the Sacred Volume. But to whom did he fear so to appear? To the ignorant, as he himself observes. Of so much more weight to the *ignorant* multitude is custom than the judgment of the learned." Yes, for ages now this cowardly yielding to the prejudice of ignorance on the part of Jerome has perpetuated this religious veneration and use of these 'fables,' that by virtue of such transmission and sanctification have been used even in the liturgy of the Protestant Church of England! No doubt there are very many to-day that "could wish that it were otherwise" than that the 'fable' of Bel and the Dragon, and the Story of Susannah and the Elders are not part of the Divine Canon.

The same opposition has *still* to be encountered on this whole subject that was met by the enlightened men in the days of the Reformation, from those who, under the plea of the sacredness and inviolability of the Holy Scriptures, resisted every effort to purify these from error. We cannot pass here in conclusion, and on this whole question, giving the grand defense of Erasmus against this opposition of pious prejudice; these noble words of the great scholar of three centuries past are needed again, and

Digitized by Google

must be repeated to-day,—not against Romanists, but against Protestants! Hear him:

"I heartily assent to those who maintain, that the authority of the Holy Scriptures is inviolable. Whoever knowingly depraves them, outrages the Holy Spirit: this I acknowledge. But, that majesty resides only in the *fountain-head.* Isaiah has not erred, nor does any one attempt to alter *what he wrote:* Matthew has committed no error; no one corrects *what he transmitted.* Our business lies with his *interpreters*, his *copyists*, and his *corrupters.* If all the authority of the Sacred Scriptures was to be shaken by some corrupted readings, the Holy Spirit must needs attend the copyists, no less than the prophets and evangelists. The Holy Spirit is nowhere absent from them; but, He so discovers himself, as to *leave for us a portion of labor.* The inviolability of their authority resided in the prophets, apostles, or evangelists. The highest praise of the Scriptures is this: that though so often transfused into other languages, so often mutilated or depraved by heretics, so often corrupted by transcribers, yet they retain the vigor of eternal truth. Thus, the church stands firm, though assailed by all the storms of evil. But, he acts in the service of the Holy Spirit, who endeavors, with all his powers, to restore to its primitive integrity, whatever has been deteriorated by men. As there will never be wanting those who deteriorate, so, we ought never to cease from the task of correcting. The Scriptures themselves, therefore, are one thing; what interpreters have ill rendered, or transcribers have corrupted, are another.—Every knave can corrupt the copies of the Gospel; and shall it be forbidden to restore what has been so corrupted?"—(*Apologia* prefixed to the Gr. N. Test. Erasmi Opera, fol. Lugd. Batav. 'tom. vi.')

With these words we close, commending them earnestly to the hearts of Christian men. We have taken up this revision of the Lord's Prayer in the common version not only for its own sake, but also to keep up fresh in the minds of our readers the important question, growing more imperative every day, of giving to men the Word of God in its divine purity. C. L. L.

It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed, because his compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is thy faithfulness.—JER.

Digitized by Google

From the [London] Spectator.

THE "TEMPORAL POWER."

As we are apt to take a good deal more notice of a great fire in the next street than of those vast hydrogen cyclones in the Sun, whose flames sweep over millions of miles, so it is not perhaps unnatural that in watching the military agony of France, we have paid far too little attention to an event that is as much more important than its proximate cause, as is an explosion in the center of our system than a wee bonfire on the surface of one of its smallest planets. The relative strength of France and Germany is but the incident of a generation, which, as it has changed in one direction with the growth of one set of periodic causes, may just as well change in another direction with the growth of another set of periodic causes; there is nothing in the great reverses of France and successes of Germany which need be more than temporary, nothing in them which marks the end or beginning of an age. But the death of the Temporal Power of the Papacy, if death, as we believe, it proves, is a phenomenon of quite another order of historic importance. Succumbing as it has succumbed, after a duration of some eleven hundred and fifty years, to the National idea,—(the question to be addressed to the people of the Papal States is, we are told, to be whether or not they desire an "Italy one and indivisible"),—an idea against which it has only made head during the last twenty years by the aid of the Emperor's French garrison, the fall of the temporal power really marks an epoch if not as important as the great political revolution epoch of the last century, or the great philosophical revolution of the century previous, at least much more so than any only which dates the relative predominance of one nation and the inferiority of another. The end of the Temporal power means the failure of an experiment of great grandeur, to which all the energy of the most popular and successful of Christian Churches has been heart and soul devoted. It means the failure of ecclesiastical ideas to override the affinities of national and popular feeling. It means a confession of the impossibility of making a church do duty for a nation. It means a practical demonstration that a civil government built upon a theological system and a dogmatic theory, is a civil government built upon the sand. The Ultramon-

Digitized by Google

tanes have often told us that "the rains descended and the floods came, and the wind blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded on a rock,"—the rock of Peter. To this the world can now reply that at least as far as civil government is concerned their assertion is false,—for "it fell, and great was the fall of it." The "infallible" church, after 1150 years' trial, has failed to construct a single solid society or government rooted in the conscience and affections of the people. The domestic feelings of Christendom triumphed over the Church at the time of the Reformation, for she attempted to override instead of pacifying them. The national feelings of Christendom triumph over her now, for the same reason; she has not sanctioned and sanctified the political aspirations of nations, but, on the contrary, striven to crush them. Hence the slow dwindling of the political power of the Papacy, up to the moment of its recent dissolution. The secular power of the Papacy arose from the most natural possible causes. When the Goths and Lombards invaded Italy, the only power which stood firm and undismayed, was the power which rested on a deep spiritual faith; and of course around it the elements of a new secular society began rapidly to crystallize. It has just fallen from causes precisely corresponding to those from which it arose. Instead of exerting a creative, sustaining, and sanitary influence on the affairs of the world, it had for centuries been exerting a cramping and destructive influence upon them. Instead of standing as a fresh spiritual power among the discords of earthly passions, uttering the voice of purest consciences, and boldly opposing the march of stately injustice, it had become a power that finessed with courts for its own temporal safety,—that too often blessed princes who had their feet on the necks of the people, if only they supported the Pope against his enemies,—that resisted despotism (as in Poland) only when despotism happened to be schismatic,—that withdrew its half-formed and faltering blessing on Italian freedom the moment it seemed likely to endanger Papal authority,—and, in a word, more than compensated the wholesome influence of the most spiritual elements in its Christian faith, by its public exhibition of political imbecility, helplessness, and time-serving towards the powers of the world. The "Vicar of Christ," as the Popes have all loved to call themselves, gained his temporal power because he could honestly say with Christ, "The Prince of this world cometh and

Digitized by Google

hath nothing in me." He lost it because, if he had at once self-knowledge and candor, he might truly have said, at least in his capacity of temporal ruler, "The Prince of this world hath made me his slave; Christ cometh, and hath nothing in me." The fall of the temporal power is, in fact, the result of the loss of that spiritual power which the popes once exerted. When they were *more* truly spiritual rulers than the secular powers of the world, they grew in strength; when they became *less* spiritual than the secular powers of the world, they lost in strength; when they became nearly the least truly spiritual of all the rulers of the nations, and began to force their alliances and to mold their policy with less real concern for the true liberty, strength and manliness of the people under their control, than even the most blundering and coarse of the popular governments around them, their temporal power was doomed, and awaited but the fall of a few artificial props, to expire.

But the fall of the Temporal Power is so great an event, not merely because it marks the final failure of the first great and serious attempt to push a spiritual theology systematically into the political and social outworks of every-day life, but because it can not but modify the attitude of millions towards the authority of the only church which wields a really great external authority,—an authority independent of the spiritual truth it preaches,—over the imaginations and consciences of men. The "Eternal City" has been a sort of standing monument to the power of that Church and her great place in history. The Pope has been a spiritual power standing apart from all the world, in the capital of that old pagan empire over which he triumphed,—nay, at the center, we may say, of all human history,—on an island which defied the gross authority of political States. The Roman Catholics have been quite right in their almost instinctive feeling that this position of his had a great charm for the imaginations of men,—that his subjection to the authority of any secular power would have dissipated that charm, destroyed his unique position, and assimilated his position to that of the ordinary religious potentates of earth, the various patriarchs and archbishops who are subject to the laws of their respective States, and are unable to emancipate their minds from the influences which those laws naturally exercise. With the temporal power that distinctive position departs. Wherever he stays or goes, the Pope will have to reckon with the

Digitized by Google

powers that be. Even if the Leonine city should be permanently left under his rule, he will not be able within so narrow a realm to bid defiance to the civil laws of the city and kingdom from which that realm is hollowed out. The tradition of centuries will be broken. The singular destiny which has appeared—no doubt, very falsely—to protect him absolutely from the rude interference of human politics, will be at an end. There will no longer be a spot of earth where a Roman Catholic penetrated with the ecclesiastical system in which he has been educated can live without incurring rude collisions with the actual life of the age. The protective system established over the conscience,—which, however, in the Roman States, has unfortunately not proved inconsistent with such great concessions to the spirit of the world as the establishment of State lotteries,—will have to consult everywhere the conditions imposed by the morale of the political Societies amidst which the Church finds herself. Undoubtedly, one great fascination of Roman Catholicism will have disappeared. Rome will have become Roman as distinguished from Roman Catholic. The Vatican will be only one of the curiosities in the capital of Italy; and foreign Catholics will criticise the "Italian" influences at work upon the Vatican. The cosmopolitan character of the Church will necessarily suffer. Those who submitted to the Roman Pontiff may hesitate to submit to the Italian Pontiff. The mere authority of the Pope must dwindle; his spiritual authority will again begin to depend on his spiritual character, on the severity of his justice, the boldness of his resistance to wrong, the truthfulness of his intellect, the sincerity of his humility and love. As his prestige departs, he will be driven back on his real spiritual resources, and the weak and bad and narrow-minded Popes will have less and less power to rule the Church.

Again, the fall of the Temporal Power, directly it is seen to be permanent, will strike a final blow at the theory of the Pope's infallibility. For the Pope, when "speaking *ex cathedra*, and in discharge of the office of Pastor and Doctor of all Christians," and defining "by virtue of his supreme apostolical authority," has committed himself to the view that the temporal power is necessary in the divine plan to the execution of the spiritual duties of the Vicar of Christ. And now the very Pope who has expressed himself on these matters with the greatest clearness and vigor, and who has just been declared infallible in all such utterances, is

Digitized by Google

deprived of the temporal power under circumstances which seem to promise that that deprivation will be final. Can there be a harder blow at the doctrine of the infallibility of this organ of the Church of God? Can there be a heavier blow at the external authority of the Church which declared that infallibility? Of course, it will not strike home till the world sees that the Temporal Power is gone, not to be restored; but this, we imagine, it will begin to see very soon. That the Roman Catholic Church may continue to live, in some sense or other, by its theology, and its doctrine, and its social spirit, after the assumption of final authority which has hitherto been its great distinction from all other Churches is universally rejected, we think very probable and desirable. But the death of the present and visible organization must precede such a resurrection. It must die to dogmatic authority before it can live again to spiritual influence.

The history of the Temporal Power of the "Vicar of Christ" has, indeed, been a strange parody on the history of him whose Vicar he claims to be,—of Him of whom it is written that when he "perceived that they would come and take him by force to make him a king, he departed into a mountain himself alone." His "Vicars," on the contrary, as they proudly term themselves, when they have seen the people coming by force to take away their kingdom, have summoned all the powers of the world to defend and fortify the mountain on which they are enthroned,—not alone, but among palaces and courts. Hitherto there has almost always been some one of these powers which thought it its interest to lend that aid. Now, for the first time, that aid seems likely to be permanently withheld. The scepter is departed from the Pontiff and the lawgiver from between his feet; and he has to learn once more the lesson of the early Church, how to leaven with spiritual leaven a world in which he exerts no external power. It will be a hard trial, and one that will lead to the decomposition and reorganization of the Roman, and perhaps many other, Churches, before its full effects are seen; but still we will believe that the death of the Temporal Power will issue in the resurrection of a truer spiritual power than Europe has had any experience of during centuries of petty ecclesiastical tyrannies, and not very much less petty ecclesiastical rebellions.

Digitized by Google

THE INFLUENCE OF OCCUPATION ON HEALTH.

Man, intended and qualified by his physical structure and intellectual powers to rule over all the kingdoms of life, is the only true cosmopolite. Every climate has its peculiar types of life developed wholly or in part within its borders. The fauna of the Arctic regions are never found within the borders of a more temperate zone, nor do the inhabitants of the tropics stray beyond the boundaries which nature has ordained for them. The birds and fishes, it is true, are migratory ; but they follow the changing seasons. Man is the only being who adapts himself with equal facility to the rigors of an Arctic winter and the burning heat of an equatorial sun. This power of human adaptability is not confined to the matter of climate; it applies equally to our occupations, and in all our studies concerning the physical laws which regulate health, the fact must not be lost sight of that man is as truly intended to be a social and intellectual, as he is to be a a merely geographical cosmopolite. In observing the influences of climate, we notice at once that men are subject to a law of limitation. While the species is one, it is divided into races, each possessing its own physical peculiarities governed by the climate which it occupies. The same is true in regard to occupation. While the different employments tend to develop or deteriorate the various qualities naturally belonging to man, certain employments, just like certain climates, especially if continued through a series of generations, produce the highest type of manhood, and however far the intellectual attainments of men may remove them from a state of nature, it by no means follows that the laws of physical health or development are thereby violated. We make these suggestions, in order to show that any investigation of the health of the different occupations must not be conducted on a purely physical basis; the mind is as much concerned as the body in hygienic laws. Sanitary science is of very modern growth, and as was observed in a recent report of the Board of Health of this city, we are probably indebted to Dr. Farr, the English Register General, more than to any other man for our present knowledge concerning it. Much has been written in America, as well as abroad, concerning the different occupations, but reliable facts and figures have scarcely been reached as yet in our own country. The at-

Digitized by Google

tention of American statisticans has been chiefly confined to the sickness produced by climate and social conditions. Many very interesting facts, however, have resulted from the observations in Europe, where, the population being more compact, a better opportunity is furnished to eliminate the influences of location, and study the different effects of employment by themselves.

Labor naturally divides itself into that which is chiefly manual and that which is intellectual. We propose to look at each of these classes by itself. Of twelve classes of persons observed by Dr. Farr, the health of each estimated according to the proportion that died during the period of middle life, was as follows:

	Died out of every 1000.
Farmers	12
Shoemakers	15
Weavers	15
Grocers	16
Tailors	17
Blacksmiths	17
Carpenters	17
Laborers	17
Miners	20
Bakers	21
Butchers	23
Keepers of Taverns and Alehouses	28

Dr. Farr remarks on this list, that the health of the farmer over the laborer is considerable at every age after 35, but between the ages of 25 and 35, it is somewhat less. But that at every period of life the mortality of tavern-keepers is in excess of all others.

Mr. Milne furnishes the statistics of eight English towns from which it appears that of three classes observed, the gentry, the tradesmen, and the laborers, the first enjoyed in all the towns an average length of life over the second of from 7 to 19 years, and these again over the third of from 3 to 17. In a report prepared several years since by order of the Massachusetts Legislature, on the health of the different classes in that State, the farmers again head the list of manual occupations, enjoying on the average 64 years, while the butchers, blacksmiths, hatters, coopers, carpenters, shipwrights, and masons, hold the second place, enjoying, one with another, from 47 to 58 years. After these come the jewelers, machinists, shoemakers, tailors, and painters, ranging from 36 to 44 years. The operatives and clerks have but about 34 years among them. This is perhaps in the main as complete

Digitized by Google

and condensed a summary as we yet possess of the effect of the different trades on American life. Superintendent Kennedy, of the Commissioners at Washington, called attention in his last report to the importance of gathering reliable statistics on this point, but it will readily be perceived that all statistics must be collected with great caution where the different classes predominate in different sections of the country; for instance, in the statistics of Mr. Milne, quoted above, the health of the gentry in those towns which were unfavorable to life, was inferior to that of the laborer in the more healthy town. Mr. Lombard gives as the result of his observations substantially the same facts; the agriculturists enjoying 60 years of life; the masons and butchers 54 years; carpenters, 49 years; painters, millers and bakers, 43 years; stone-cutters, 34 years. Now, in view of these figures which, if we had space, might be substantiated by others, what are the laws that govern these sanitary facts ? A German author has well said that cities are the graves of our race, and the truth of his remark has long received a melancholy exemplification in the steady tide of humanity which is constantly setting from the country districts into the neighboring towns to supply the waste of life.

A wide circle of influences unite to make the life of the farmer the most healthy of all the occupations mentioned. Hufeland denominates light, heat, and air, the three celestial gifts which with great propriety may be called the friends and guardian spirits of life. The chemical influence of light on the tissues and functions of plants is well known, but that it plays an equally important part in animal life has not yet been so generally recognized; here, however, its agency is two-fold, chemical on the system itself, and mental, light being as important to invigorate the mind as the body. Its effect must have been noticed by every one when the sunshine has succeeded a long period of storm, in the fresh elasticity imparted to the whole frame. The wide difference between the air of the town and country, the most important of all sanitary influences at work, has received of late so much attention on all sides that it is only necessary to allude to it. There are two or three other facts connected with the farmer's life to which we wish to call especial attention. The first is the character of his work. It is calculated more than any other to call into healthy exercise all the bodily functions. So varied is its character that no set of organs are compelled to suffer a constant strain while

Digitized by Google

the others are not exercised; seasons of hard work are followed by days of rest, so that the wear and tear of the system is replenished from month to month. Another fact is the temperance of his diet. It has long since been noticed by physicians that while the American public was loud in its condemnation of excessive drinking, the really more mischievous effects of intemperate eating were passed over in silence. The British agriculturist has often through poverty suffered for want of proper regimen. A few years ago the official returns in that country showed that while the agricultural laborer subsisted on 122 oz. of food weekly, the able-bodied pauper enjoyed 157 oz., and the convict in some cases as high as 300.

But the American farmer is seldom so poor that he cannot supply himself with a sufficient quantity of plain and hearty fare. Closely connected with the matter of diet, is his temperance in his general habits of life; he is compelled by his insulation to be eminently domestic, so that he is not addicted to those unnatural hours or excitements which are the bane of city life. Again, the farmer enjoys a position of comparative independence. If he is compelled to work hard, it is with the assurance that he is less liable than most to the fluctuations of trade; the means of livelihood are always within his reach and his mind is freed from those harrassing cares and privations which are sure to attend periods of financial distress in the cities. Such are a summary, we think, of the causes of agricultural health. It is plain that the natural laws of life are more closely followed here than among any of the other classes. We have been thus specific in noticing the different advantages enjoyed by the farmer, because it would seem that just in proportion as these different conditions are violated in the other occupations, is their prospect of long life lessened. Turning our attention to the other occupations, we see that the greater majority of those engaged in them are the inhabitants of the cities and manufacturing towns. Every department of labor here has it peculiar mode of life dependent in part on the circumstances resulting from the work itself and in part on the peculiar influences and associations with which the workman is surrounded; of course, it will always be impossible to separate these externals from the direct effect of occupation. The tenants of the hovels and tenement-houses, and the dark and poisonous alleys will be largely composed of the day laborers, the lowest and

Digitized by Google

most deadly haunts of vice and pleasure will draw their patrons from the same class, so that the measure of health enjoyed by any class must always be the resultant of the work itself, and those habits of life which indirectly result from it. Next after the farmer, rank those trades where active manual labor engaged in during stated hours in the open air or in well ventilated shops is united to a degree of skill, which gives some play to mental activity; such are the joiner, the carpenter, the blacksmith, the mason, and the shipwright. In all employments where the natural functions of the bodily organs are interfered with, the standard of health is lowered; the jeweler and tailor, from their cramped and sedentary employment, tend to diseases of the chest; the painter, the grinder, and the stone-mason have their lives shortened from the poisonous and irritating materials which they employ, being introduced into the system. The short and sickly life of the operative in the large manufacturing towns is well summed up by Dr. Morgan, an eminent English physician, in a pamphlet warning his countrymen that their race was decaying. He remarks that the factory hand wants physical stamina, and his muscular system is rarely well strung. His pulse tells of want of power in the heart, and its variations are rapid under the least excitement; his feet are cold, his veins are prominent, he is given to vertigo, and his lips are blanched and colorless, while the naturally sickly influences of the factory are heightened by the murky mass of noxious vapors snd gasses that obscure the sun and vitiate the air. The unwholesome conditions of the operative's life are experienced, though not to the same extent, in the American towns as well as in those of Europe, and are aggravated by the mental and physical sufferings produced by periodical stagnations of business. The only other classes of manual employments which we have room to notice, are the lowest forms of labor, where skill and intellectual activity are almost lost sight of. The day laborer and miner are types of this class. Unable to select their times or places of work, they are exposed to the inclemencies of the weather, and the influences of unhealthy locality; the former retiring from their toil often to ill-constructed and badly-ventilated rooms, surrounded with filth, in the most sickly localities. The miner, shut out from light and air in the damp atmosphere of the mines, often impregnated with gas, is a proverbially short-lived man. These classes are types of purely physical energy. The

Digitized by Google

nervous activity of the brain is wanting, their enjoyments are the mere gratification of the sensuous appetites, often leading them into the lowest and most destructive dissipations. Fevers, epidemics, and violence seizing on their constitutions, broken in middle life, result in sudden deaths.

Turning now to the second class of employments, those belonging to the brain, we are met with a still more interesting series of facts. Here we meet with man in his intellectual type. We do not look for the development of physical force which will carry him safely over the pitfalls of life—the force is of another kind, but none the less potent. Combe says in his "Constitution of Man," "there is an additional benefit arising from healthy activity of the brain, which is little known. The brain is the fountain of nervous energy to the whole body." According as this nervous energy is exercised, it imparts or impairs vitality. In the report to the Massachusetts Legislature, noticed above, it appeared that bank officers and judges were more favored by length of life than even farmers, while clergymen, lawyers, physicians and merchants ranked with the best of the trades. Teachers, bankers, and musicians ranging with the more unhealthy employments of the painter, tailor, the shoemaker, and the clerk. These few facts serve to introduce us to the laws which govern health in this department. Muscular development and constant activity of the body are not needed; such exercise and diet alone is necessary as shall keep the organs in their nominal and healthy condition. Apart from the violation of physical laws, the kind of activity to which the brain is subject, determines the health. The effect of emotions and passions, when allowed full scope, is to shorten life; the effect of purely intellectual activity is to prolong it just in proportion as that activity is regular, and placid in its character, and allied to studies pertaining to the familiar occupations of men. To illustrate what we mean, we quote the following table from Dr. Madden's "Infirmities of Genius": Natural philosophers attain to the average age of 75; moral philosophers, sculptors, painters, legal and medical authors, 69 to 70; musical composers, 64; novelists and dramatists, 62; and poets, 56.

The close alliance between the mind and body causes every unhealthy disturbance of the former to react on the other; depression of spirits the arrests processes of digestion and assimilation; ear and anxiety act upon the heart and respiration, and it would

Digitized by Google

seem that in all excess of emotion, the nervous energy which nature intended should be produced in the brain and diffused through the system, was produced in excess and wasted by that organ itself. The tranquilizing influence of philosophy and its regulative power over the habits of life are seen in the age to which those engaged in this study attain, while those who, like the novelist, employ more largely the imaginative powers, fall far below. The poet revels in the flights of fancy; the unreal, the dreamland is his home; none, as a class, suffer the extremes of pleasure and pain like him. His mind is a stage on which the emotions are almost constant players, and as a natural result, he falls first from the ranks of genius.

Of the three learned professions, the lawyers are, as a class, probably the most healthy in America. The sick room, the exposure, broken rest, and responsibilities of the medical profession tell heavily on the strength of both body and mind. The clergy, in this country at least, too often feel constrained to lead an unnatural life; their minds are removed from the elastic influences of every-day life by the subject of their study; constant attention directed to a single matter, where the emotional and imaginative is so largely concerned, combines with confinement, over-work, and ill-ventilated halls, to impair the elasticity of both mind and body, and chronic debility fastens itself on many in early life.

We have not room to push these observations further. It has been our effort to show that health is not the special property of the physical or intellectual type of man. So far as employment itself is concerned he may be a cosmopolite, so long as he does no violence to the natural laws of his being. Whatever may be his occupation, the hours of recreation must be employed to repair the particular energies that have been wasted. It is the neglect to do this, to find in the times of absence from the shop and the study a remedy against the threatened disorder, that entails on humanity the multiplied disorders of civilized life.—*Technologist.*

"*The Little Sower.*"—This spirited Sunday School paper has been steadily gaining in favor. See advertisement on the cover, and note especially the reduction in its price.

Digitized by Google

THE NEW HYMN AND TUNE BOOK.

As we have received a number of letters making inquiry concerning the forthcoming HYMN AND TUNE BOOK, we deem it proper to make the following announcement:

1st. The work is rapidly progressing, and we expect to have it ready about the first of February, 1871.

2d. The book will contain about eight hundred of the choicest hymns of the Christian Hymn Book, and will have music adapted to *all* the hymns in the Christian Hymn Book. This adaptation will be indicated in an index; so that when the hymn is announced from the hymn book the singers can immediately turn to the page of the Hymn and Tune Book where a suitable tune may be found.

3d. The book will contain a large per cent. of the old popular tunes, that have stood the test of ages, and also a great number of new pieces of unquestionable merit. We expect several new pieces to appear composed expressly for the work by some of the most distinguished musicians and composers in this country.

4th. All the tunes will be adapted to congregational singing.

5th. The book will contain over *one hundred and thirty varieties of metres.* In this respect it will excel any book now published in the United States. In fact we doubt if there can be found *anywhere*, a book containing the same number of metres. This of itself will render the book invaluable.

6th. It will be of convenient size and form, such as can easily be carried in the pocket, and will be printed from clear, open type, so as to give satisfaction to old and young alike.

7th. The price of the book cannot now be determined with certainty, but will be furnished at the very lowest possible figures. The retail price will not exceed one dollar, from which liberal discount will be made to the trade. *This will make it by far the cheapest book of the kind published.*

The trustees are determined that no means shall be spared to make it in every respect acceptable to our brotherhood, and to this end have secured the counsel and assistance of a large number of the singers and preachers among our own people, as well as valuable aid from some of the most distinguished composers of music in the United States.

In conclusion we desire to say that any suggestions from brethren in reference to the work will be gratefully received and duly considered if addressed to the undersigned.

R. M. BISHOP, *Chn. Board of Trustees.*

Digitized by Google

"CURT."

"The Scripture has not yet been found, that makes the use of an instrument of music in the praise of God a bar to the fellowship of the saints."—W. K. P, —*Millennial Harbinger.*

"Granted. Nor has the Scripture yet been found that gives the Christian the right to use an instrument of music in the praise of God. May we do the things that are not expressly forbidden in the Scriptures?"

We find the above in the *Apostolic Times.* It is asked, "May we do the things that are not expressly forbidden in the Scriptures?" and I answer, The question is ambiguous. It may mean by "the things," everything; and in this sense, I answer, No. But it may mean "some things," and in this sense, I answer, Yes. And now what does the question amount to? Does it throw any light on the issue, or embarrass the advocate of either side?—Questions are good, when rightly put. Lord Bacon commends the *prudens quæstio*, but this is one that is born of logical discernment, and puts nature and reasoning alike to the test. Let it be understood, then, that we teach, and have steadfastly argued from the beginning of this controversy about instrumental music, 1st. That the use of an instrument of music in the public praise of the Christian church, is neither expressly allowed nor expressly forbidden in the New Testament. 2nd. That there are many things which are not expressly forbidden in the Scriptures, which, nevertheless, it is wrong for a Christian to do,—and that there are also many things, which are not so expressly forbidden, which it is even praiseworthy for a Christian to do,—and therefore, that the simple fact that a thing is not expressly forbidden is not a test by which we can decide whether it may be done or not. 3rd. That of things not expressly forbidden, there are two classes—*first*, things wrong in themselves; *second*, things indifferent in themselves, but wrong because of the injurious consequences which follow from their use. Questions concerning the *first* of these classes must be decided hy the general principles of Christian *morality;* questions concerning the *second*, must be decided by the principle of Christian *expediency.* To the *second class* we refer the question concerning the use of musical instruments in the public praise of the Christian church. In itself, as Paul said of the meat offered in sacrifice to idols, the musical instrument *is noth-*

Digitized by Google

ing,—that is, has no essential moral quality; but in its use, may or may not be "expedient," according as it tends or does not tend to *edification*. Being not wrong in itself, it is "lawful;" but being destructive of or a hindrance to "edification," it is "inexpedient." This we understand to be the general principle upon which Paul reasons in his tenth chapter of 1st Corinthians, and this, in brief, is our whole argument concerning the use of instruments of music in the public praise of the church, and this the process by which we reach the conclusion, that they ought not to be employed.

Concerning the isolated remark which is quoted over my initials, I have to say, it is an *argumentum ad hominem*, and that its logical force is this: that those who contend that we must have "a thus saith the Lord" for everything in our faith and practice, ought surely to be able to show one for so grave a step as dividing the church on the question of musical instruments; but none has yet been found that makes instrumental music a ground for such a step,—therefore they cannot logically divide the church on this question.

Let our arguments have relevancy to the true issues, and we shall soon emerge into the light. W. K. P.

LITERARY NOTICES.

THE LIFE OF ELDER JOHN SMITH—*By John Augustus Williams.* —This is one of the finest works of biography we have ever read. The accomplished author has succeeded in doing that which is the most difficult thing, in this kind of writing;—he has, without exaggeration or fiction, added a charm to the life of John Smith greater than it had before, even with his most intimate friends and admirers. We knew him well, loved and admired him; but we seem to know him better, to love and admire him more, through the representations of his "Life," than ever before. This is the fascination which imagination gives to truth—the setting of the diamond, that brings out its prismatic beauty.

We are gratified to learn, that the work has already reached a wide circulation. It needs only to be known, to find a warm welcome in every Christian home. We are mpressed, in reading it, with its almost autobiographic vividness. Much that is in it, we

Digitized by Google

have heard from the lips of the living John Smith, and the author seems to have caught, not only his *style*, but the very point and pith of his *words*. Society changes rapidly in America. The age is a fast one, and we Americans are the fastest of the age. To catch and fix the manners of a great religious era, out of which so much that is valuable has emerged, is one of the highest services of literature. This, the author of the "Life of John Smith" has admirably done for us. It is a vivid picture of what we shall see no more in the religious conflicts of society—but out of which much that we love and cherish has been born to us, and which we shall understand the better and value the more highly, through a knowledge of the struggles and hardships of the noble men by whom it has been bequeathed to us.

The work is published in the elegant style of the House of R. W. Carroll & Co., Cincinnati, O., and is offered to the public at the lowest rates of the Press. Let all who would catch new inspiration from the struggles and fidelity of a noble man of God, send for a copy of the Life of John Smith.

"THE CHRISTIAN."—This is the title of a new "weekly," published at Kansas City, Mo., and edited by brethren Geo. W. Longan, Alex. Proctor, A. B. Jones, T. P. Haley, B. H. Smith, and Geo. W. Plattenburg, It is a large folio, got up in good style, and furnished at $2.00 per annum. The *names* of these writers are a sufficient recommendation of the paper. Missouri has no nobler sons, and the church no truer ministers, and in time we hope to be warranted in saying, the press no wiser or more accomplished editors. They have a wide field around them, and this paper will excite and enlist a large circle of readers, which no other paper could hope to do, were this not published. Let it have free course to run and do good. The brethren in Missouri know and love these editors. They have stood by her in her darkest hour, with hearts that never faltered,—and now in her dawn of returning freedom and prosperity, they are fit to lead her up to the meridian of Christian growth and power.

We have two classes of religious papers—one, that meanly and slavishly echoes the common sentiment of its patrons,—another that earnestly and lovingly utters the thing that it believes to be true and good. We care very little about the former. It is only a religious *news*-paper. It helps nobody forward It tells what

Digitized by Google

has been, not what ought to be—and sits, like the monitor in a school, marking the truants, not like the inspiring teacher, waking latent activities in the soul, striking out the electric fire of thought, and building up the holy temple of truth into ever growing and majestic proportions of knowledge and holiness. There are a few of this sort—and to them we look and trust in hope. They lead the public mind into all truth,—they fill the public heart with divine charities,—they inspire the public life of the church with God. Like activities and labors. Knowing the men who edit "The Christian," we class it in advance, among the nobler sort, and as such give it our hearty welcome.

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.—We invite the attention of our brotherhood to the announcement on another page, concerning the Christian Quarterly. It cannot be that they will let the burthen of expense in publishing this magazine fall upon private hands! It will be seen elsewhere, that the HARBINGER is to be discontinued after this year, and thus many who along with our weeklies cannot afford to take more than one magazine of more permanent literature, will be free to subscribe for the Quarterly. The verdict of the brotherhood is that we shall have a Quarterly, and the judgment is unequivocal that the one we have is most worthy. It is not expected that it will have a very large roll of subscribers. This religious Quarterlies never do—but surely there are men enough among us who can enjoy and appreciate articles of the metal found in the Quarterlies to support *one* among us. In this faith the ever zealous managing editor, Brother W. T. Moore, and the enterprising publishers, the Messrs. Carroll & Co., have determined to enter upon the experiment of another year. If I could feel the same guarantee of success in patronage, that I do as to the ability of its editorial conduct, then would I be sure of its future.

It is said that merit is the surest guarantee of success—but this is relative. The *material* of a literary work, no matter how perfect i is, may yet be such as to suit the taste and culture of but a small class of readers, and of course its circulation will be comparatively small. This is true of the kind of articles which alone are fit for Quarterlies. We cannot doubt, however, that there are more than enough of such readers among us to give abundant support to this, the only magazine in this field which we publish,—and it

Digitized by Google

is only necessary that they should come up and respond generously to the call which is now made upon them. We have able and willing writers,—shall we not find also numerous appreciative readers ? W. K. P.

THE HARBINGER TO BE DISCONTINUED.

As the time is approaching when our friends will begin to renew their subscriptions for the HARBINGER, I deem it proper in advance, to announce that we have concluded to discontinue the visits of this oldest of our periodicals, with the close of the present volume. Other work has so grown upon our hands, that we must either neglect it for the HARBINGER, or discontinue the HARBINGER for it. Between the two, it is thought by nearest friends best that we should prefer the former, and in this judgment we are constrained reluctantly to concur. The HARBINGER is now near the close of the 41st volume. If we are spared we shall bring it to completion. For nearly thirty years of its career we have been connected with its publication—and for seven years, its proprietor. We consent to its termination with feelings of sadness. It seems like the breaking up of a long communion, the parting of friends, with whom we have walked about the courts of Zion in sweet counsel for many years,—the sundering of chords of loving fellowship, that shall be renewed on earth no more forever. It is not from fickleness that we take this step,—this is not my nature; nor is it from the desire of respite from labor,—this, the position which I hold as president of Bethany College, and increasing demands for literary work in other fields, forbid me to expect. It is a question of relative duty—only this, and nothing more.

But it is my purpose now only to make a business announcement—and I will repeat ☞ *The Harbinger will be discontinued with the close of the present volume.* ☜ W. K. P.

OBITUARIES.

CLAYMONT, VA., Oct. 15th, 1870.

MY DEAR BRO. PENDLETON:—With an afflicted and crushed heart I announce to you, his numerous relatives, friends, and the brotherhood at large the death of my beloved and only full brother in th flesh, Joseph T. Henley.

Exerting himself beyond his physical ability in his farming operations, he ok a violent cold, resulting in rheumatism, accompanied with a stricture of

Digitized by Google

the esophagus or swallow, and an entire prostration of his nervous system, which carried him off on the 13th inst., in the 53d year of his natural, and 35th of his christian life.

With a firm and unfaltering faith and trust in the Blessed Savior, and with an assured, blissfull hope of a glorious resurrection into eternal life, he fell asleep in the Lord, leaving to bemoan their loss, and to cherish with a deathless affection the precious memory of his worth, a wife, who had been to him a help- meet indeed, (a ministering angel through all the weary watchings of the night, and tedious hours and days of his illness, having shared and divided with him the sorrows and doubled the joys of a quarter of a century of wedded happiness), and eight children, four sons and four daughters, all of whom, save the two youngest girls, were members with him of Smyrna church.

In his temporal affairs he was eminently p[illegible]ical and successful; in all his business transactions and inter[illegible]urse with his fellows, he was courteous, punctual, and rigidly honest. In his religious life and family duties and relationships he was unflinchingly faithful, simple, sincere and happy. As a husband and father he was affectionate and self sacrificing, deeply devoted to their happiness and training up, in the muture and admonition of the Lord. As a church member his loss is greatly felt and deplored. Possessing no talents for public speaking, he was not at all demonstrative, but as a worker he had but few equals. Of him it may truly be said he was "ready to every good word and work," a model of punctuality, never absenting himself from the house of worship, except for sickness. To him are we indebted for the first suggestion as to organized efforts to educate pious young men for the ministry; and to this good work has he ever given his best efforts. His prayers and his means beyond any brother known to the Educational Board. The death of such an one is a great and grevious loss to his family, the church and the world.

Impressed at the very outset of his attack that his hour of departure had come, with complacency and calmness he set his house in order, and prepared to meet his God. When asked after his spiritual condition the happy response and the clear chorus of his last communings were: "I am fully persuaded that He who has sustained me thus far will not forsake me in the hour of my greatest need." "I want to be with Jesus, &c." "Not my will, O God, but thine be done." "Victory!"

"Dear as thou wert, and justly dear,
We would not weep for thee:
One thought shall check the starting tear,—
It is that thou art free.

And thus shall faith's consoling power
The tears of love restrain;
O, who that saw thy parting hour,
Could wish thee here again!

Gently thy parting spirit fled,
Sustained by grace divine.
O may such grace on us be shed,
And make our end like thine!"

S. S. HENLEY.

Digitized by Google

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, 1871.

W. T. MOORE, Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

W. K. PENDLETON, | ISAAC ERRETT, | ROBERT GRAHAM,
S. E. SHEPARD, | THOS. MUNNELL, | ALEXANDER PROCTOR.

The Christian Quarterly has now been published during two years, without regard to the question of gain or loss. It has established itself among the foremost religious periodicals of this or any other country, with reference both to its literary merits and mechanical execution. Its editors have not used it as a vehicle for their own contributions only, but have rather exerted themselves to have its pages occupied by the best talent in the Christian Church. Among those who have heretofore contributed articles are the following well-known writers, viz:

W. K. Pendleton, B. Hinsdale, Thomas Munnel, J. S. Lamar, S. E. Shepard, J. F. Rowe, John A. Brooks, Robert Graham, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Procter, R. Milligan, Isaac Errett, B. U. Watkins, James Challen, A. N. Gilbert, J. A. Reubelt, David Walk, Henry D. Moore, H. Turner, L. L. Pinkerton, Marie R. Butler, R. Richardson, W. J. Barbee, F. W. Emmons, Jas. W. Wilmarth, B. J. Pinkerton, W. T. Moore.

The editors already have assurances of contributions from many other of the most talented men connected with the Church, for the coming year. The question now is, how shall a circulation worthy of its acknowledged merits be secured? Its publishers and editors have resolved that the QUARTERLY shall be issued during 1871, in the hope of placing it upon a permanent basis for the future. To put it within the reach of all, the price has been reduced to

$3.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE,

making it the cheapest periodical of the kind now published. This very low price, and the eminent position that the QUARTERLY holds before the literary and religious world, make strong appeals to its friends for support. All intelligent persons in the Christian Church, her missionaries and other ministers, are appealed to in the hope that they will exert themselves to extend the circulation of this work, which is published mainly for their benefit.

No discount can be made to agents or clubs. The price will be uniform to all, so that no one need wait for his neighbors to unite with him, but should at once forward $3.00 for the year. If only one number is subscribed for, the price will be four dollars. It will be to the interest of every one to subscribe at once, and for the year.

Need members of the Church of Christ be urged to sustain the QUARTERLY? Those engaged in conducting it do not feel that it would be becoming to put themselves in the position of suppliants. If the QUARTERLY has not earned a claim to liberal support at the hands of Christians, all that can be said will not recommend it more effectively. With this statement, the success of the QUARTERLY is left with those who are most nearly interested in the progress of the Church of Christ.

All money should be sent to R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers, Cincinnati, while all literary communications should be addressed to the undersigned.

W. T. MOORE.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., NOVEMBER, 1870. [No. XI.

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 541.)

While Origen (220–250) was elaborating the doctrine of three distinct persons or hypostases, and fell into the error of denying unity of *substance*, others in a one-sided view of the unity of substance, denied altogether the triality of hypostatical distinction. Others again denied that the Son was anything more than a mere creature,—so that in the course of a century and a half from the apostolic age we find several distinct schemes of speculation prevalent on this subject. These all may be reduced to *four:*

1. The theory known as Sabellianism, which made the Son the Father and the Father the Son.

2. The theory which, in opposition to Sabellianism, made τρεις αρχας, *three Principles*, and consequently three independent, separate hypotases, unallied to each other, and not united in one substance or nature. This is known and condemned as *Tritheism*.

3. A third theory, also in opposition to Sabellianism, made the Father alone the one God, and considered the Son and Spirit as mere creatures.

4. And a fourth, the general view of the church—the view, therefore, called orthodox, and which is thus stated by Dionysius of Rome (260). Reasoning against Tritheism, he says: Therefore it concerns us by all means, not to divide the venerable Divine Unity or Monad (μοναδα) into three deities (θεοτητας) nor to dimin-

Digitized by Google

ish the pre-eminent majesty and greatness of our Lord by making him a creature; but to believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus his Son, and in the Holy Spirit; and that the Word is united (unified, *ηγωσθαι*) with the God over all: for he says, 'I and my Father are one,' and 'I am in the Father and the Father in me.' So shall the Divine Trinity (*ἡ θεια τριας*) as also the sacred doctrine of the Unity (*μοναρχια*) be preserved." Again, he says, "The Divine Word must of necessity be united (unified) with the God of the universe; and it is necessary that the Holy Spirit abide and be immanent in God; and the Divine Trinity (*τριαδα*) be gathered together, and united into One, as into a certain head (*κορυφην*), viz., the God of the Universe—the Almighty." —Waterland's Second Defense, Query II.

1. Sabellianism is only developed Patripassianism or Monarchianism. The three names are only indications of phases of the same general class of Anti-trinitarians. The Patripassians were so called, because of the doctrine that it was the Father in his divine essence, in alliance with a physical organization, that suffered for the sin of the world. The Monarchians were so called because they asserted the Monad and denied the Triad. The theological meaning of this word, I am surprised to find, is not given, either in Webster's or Worcester's Dictionary. Its special thought is that there is but one Principle in the divine essence. Sabellianism is only the full scientific development of the same cardinal distinction—made by the eminent man by whose name the system is distinguished.

If we would distinguish these phases, we would say that the Patripassians and Monarchians asserted the deity of Christ—but affirmed that there was only one divine person, who, in his abstract simplicity, his concealed unrevealed nature, is called God the Father: but who in the revelation of himself in the incarnation, or in creating a universe and revealing himself to it, is called God the Son or Logos. They deny to Christ any true human soul, and represent him as only an incarnation, a form of manifestation of the absolute one, who himself suffered for the world.

Praxeas of Asia Minor (A. D. 200); Noetus of Smyrna (230), and Beryl, Bishop of Bostra in Arabia (250) are the most illustrious exponents of this view. They were opposed respectively chiefly by Tertullian, Hyppolytus and Origen, and denounced as heretics by the acknowledged representatives of orthodoxy.

Digitized by Google

Sabellianism was a fuller and more elaborate development of the same cardinal anti-trinitarian doctrine, but with a far more ingenious accommodation of the parts of the system to the language of the Scriptures. The advocates of this theory are sometimes called *nominal Trinitarians*. They admitted that the Son and Holy Spirit were divine—but distinguished between divinity and deity. The concealed unrevealed deity streaming forth like the rays of the sun, manifested himself in two Powers, the illuminating and the enlivening. These are not *persons* or *hypostases*, but only emanations from the essential deity, to be re-absorbed again when the special work, for which the manifestation is made, is accomplished. The Christ is indeed more than an ordinary man under divine influence. The Logos enters into real *union* with his humanity, but only for and during his earthly life. At the ascension, it is withdrawn into the depths of the divine essence. Hence the Trinitarianism is transitory. The name of the Son is not applied to the Logos, but only to the *person* resulting from the union of the Logos and the man Jesus. "The Logos is in itself, only Logos;—with its humanization it first becomes the Son of God." Hence "the Logos is called the Son of God, not in respect to essence, but only in reference to a certain relation." "It may be gathered," says Neander (vol. i. p. 598), from the whole coherence of this system, that in it the personality of Christ could not be regarded as anything possessed of an eternal subsistence, but only as a transitory appearance. The ultimate end of all is defined by Sabellius to be this: that the Logos, after having conducted the souls created in his image to their perfection, would return back into his original being, into oneness with the Father,—the τριας would again resolve itself into the μονας. Whence it necessarily follows, that, when everything has reached this ultimate end, God once more withdraws into himself the power of the Logos, which had been hypostatized into self-subsistent, personal existence; and, consequently, this personal existence is itself annihilated.

Father, Son and Holy Spirit are but three προσωπα, showings of the face, or manifestations in time, of the one God, for special purposes in connection with redemption, to cease when that work is accomplished, that God, as the absolute one, may be all in all; in which sense, Neander thinks, "probably Sabellius interpreted 1 Cor. 15: 28." He converted the real distinction of persons (the

Digitized by Google

trinity of essence) into a distinction of mere modes (a trinity of manifestations).

Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch (260), is sometimes named as a Sabellian—but his views had none of the tendency to Pantheism, which lay at the bottom of the emanation theory of Sabellius. He rather approached the Deistic view. The Logos is in relation to God nothing more than reason in relation to man, the Spirit in relation to God nothing other than the spirit in relation to man. The divine reason or wisdom dwelt and operated in Christ only in a higher degree than in any one else. Christ was in fact a mere man, pre-eminently filled with the divine wisdom—not God by nature, but becoming God by the development of the divine in him. This is a form of deism fashionable in certain places in our own time; but it isolates God and man, as to any real union, and makes the existence of Christ begin with his nativity.

This survey of the history of the doctrines held on this great subject, presents us with two opposing schemes, which divided the speculations of the church up to the beginning of the 4th century—Sabellianism or Monarchianism, holding to the unity of substance and denying proper personality or triality of essence—and the subordination theory, which denied the doctrine of the identity of essence and affirmed a trinity of hypostatical distinctions.

This latter view was pushed by Arius to extremes which called forth the most earnest opposition, and led at last to the calling of the celebrated Council of Nice (A. D. 325). This Arius was in no high sense a theologian or a philosopher. He was utterly unable to grasp the ideal conceptions which characterized the reasonings of Origen, and on this account reduced his system to a form so plainly subversive of the dignity and divinity of Christ, as to excite the most decided hostilty of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, under whom he was a presbyter. "In endeavoring to define the distinctions between the persons of the Trinity, he carried the idea of a subordination of the one to the other, and, in the first place, of the Son to the Father, so far as to represent the former as a creation of the latter." "We are persecuted," he says, "because we say that the Son hath a beginning, while we teach that God is αναρχος. We say, ὁτε εξ ουκ ονταων εστιν, (that he is out of nothing,) because he is no part of God, nor is he created of anything already in existence."

Digitized by Google

Alexander, his Bishop, denounced this doctrine as altogether unchristian. He summoned a council of his clergy first to oppose Arius—then a synod of Egyptian and Lybian Bishops, composed of 120 members, in 321, and succeeded in deposing him from his office and excluding him from the communion of the church. Many eminent bishops sympathized with Arius somewhat, but particularly desired to heal the breach between him and Alexander. The two Eusebiuses—Eusebius of Nicomedia, and Eusebius of Cesarea, in Palestine, the historian—made especial efforts to bring about a reconciliation. They were moved in part by their sympathy with the views of Arius, both of them holding in the main the doctrine of Origen; but their chief aim seems to have been to prevent the blow that must fall from such a controvessy upon the general peace of the church. But they could not stem the currents which were setting in now from all directions, clamorous for the adjustment of this much vexed question.

Constantine, after his victory over Licinius, in 324, coming to the sovereignty of the Roman Empire, found the church distracted by this great schism, and sought first to interpose his authority. He sent letters to Alexander and Arius. He represented the questions as rash speculations, standing in no vital relations to Christianity, and therefore to be tolerated by the parties in one another. But Constantine's ideas of the vital things of Christianity seem to comprehend but little more than a faith on Providence, and of course his opinion could have but little influence on men like Alexander and Arius. His attempt failed, and he resorted to the expedient of a general council of all the bishops in his Empire. This was called to meet at Nice, in Bithynia, A. D. 325. It is said there were 318 bishops in all, the greater part of whom were Orientals—and that the Emperor himself took an active part in the proceedings.

There were three parties represented in this council—1. Those who agreed with Arius and held that Christ was only a creature; 2. The advocates of the Homoousion, or essential unity of Father and Son; 3. The Eusebians, or those who held with Eusebius of Cesarea a middle ground between the two parties, and from whom there sprung up afterwards the party called Semi-Arians. The great problem before the council was to harmonize these conflicting views and restore peace. It would have been easy to con-

Digitized by Google

demn Arianism, had the council deemed it wise to do so, because the party was comparatively small. But the advocates of the Homoousion were not content simply to oppose Arianism. They were also opposed to the doctrine held by the dominant party of the East. They saw in it the germs of Arianism, and could not be satisfied with less than a full recognition of the Homoousion.

Both Eusebius of Cesarea and Eusebius of Nicomedia presented creeds in which the divinity of Christ was clearly affirmed, and much in the language of Scripture, but still in such form, the Homoousions thought, as allowed of an Arian explanation. Nothing would content them short of a term that could not be explained away—that could by no possible ingenuity of definition be made to harmonize with Arianism. That term was Homoousion—same essence. The controversy at length narrowed down to this one word. The demand was categorical—Homoousion, same substance, or *one essence*, γεννησις εκ της ουσιας, *begotten of the essence;—this*, or heresy. The controversy seemed irreconcilable; but the Emperor came in with his imperial nod and decided for Homoousion, and it carried. There was no resisting the imperial decree, and all bowed save Arius and two others, Thomas of Marmorica, in Lybia, and Secundus of Ptolemais. These stood out, and for this the Emperor deposed, excommunicated and banished them. Eusebius and others bowed under protest of doing it only for peace. They would *not* sign the condemnatory clauses against the Arian doctrines. But the Emperor was not slow to resort to the expedients of the Byzantine despotism to enforce the authority of this decision. He not only ordered the writings of Arius to be burned, but threatened the penalty of death against any one who should be detected in trying to preserve them.

The decision reached by this council was written in Greek. We present it to you in the following translation:

"We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, the maker of all things, visible and invisible: and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, only begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father: God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all are made that are in heaven and that are in earth; who, for us men, and for our salvation, descended, and was incarnate, and became man; suffered, and rose again the third day; ascended into the heavens; and will come to

Digitized by Google

judge the living and the dead: and in the Holy Spirit.—But those who say, that there was a time when he was not, and that he was not before he was begotten, and that he was made out of nothing, or affirm that he is of any other substance or essence (ἑτερας ὑποστασιας ἡ οὐσιας) or that the Son of God is created, mutable or changeable, the catholic church doth pronounce accursed." (Mos. I. p. 291, note 22.)

Ingenuity seems exhausted to guard against evasion or misapprehension. Origen had denied that Christ was ὁ θεος, the God—here it is said he is "very God of very God," not simply θεος, without the article. It had been said he was "created"—here it is written, "begotten, not created." It had been denied that he was of the same substance—here it is said, "consubstantial with the Father." It had been said he was made *de nihilo*, ἐξ οὐκ ὀντων, "out of nothing"—here it is said, "only begotten, of the substance (ἐκ τῆς οὐσιας) of the Father." It had been said that he had a "beginning in time"—"that he was not, before he was begotten"—and here all such as affirm this are anathematized by the church.

What could be fuller than this? But the confession was a decree of imperial authority, not a conviction of the parties, who were constrained to sign it; and though intended as a peace offering, it did not secure, with any permanency, the end desired. The Eusebian and Arian party were not slow in finding explanations to break the force of the strong doctrinal expressions which were so distasteful to them, and soon ὁμοουσιον, which was the test-word of the Nicene creed, became unpopular. Some objected that it was *unscriptural* (λεξις ἀγραφος) and were afraid lest it might give rise to the emanation theory. Means were found, too, to influence the Emperor. He was induced to think perhaps that he had dealt too harshly with Arius. At any rate, he found that the object which seems to have been supreme with him, that is, the peace of his realm, was but little promoted by his attempted harmony of conflicting doctrines, and he soon recalled Arius and others from their exile. This opened up anew the strife, and for fifty years it raged with a bitterness and zeal unparalleled in the history of speculative controversy. We cannot pretend to follow it in its details. The Eusebians would not use the word *homoousios*, but introduced the word *homoiousios*—not *same*, but *similar* substance. Another class, denying any sort of resemblance, em-

Digitized by Google

ployed the term *anomoion*=dissimilar. The three parties were called respectively, "Homoousians, Homoiousians, and Anomoians—sometimes also Eunomians, from the name of one of their most popular teachers." (Waddington, ch. H. p. 97.) The Arians proper became distinguished also from the Semi-Arians, in this, —that the former affirmed, not only that the substance of the *Word* (Logos) was different from that of the Father, but that it did not even *resemble* it; whereas the latter, while denying the consubstantiality of the two persons, affirmed *perfect likeness.*

During the 4th century 13 councils were held against Arius and 15 for him, and 17 for the Semi-Arians, in all forty-five. (Jortin, Ecc. Hist., b. iii). On the side of the Consubstantialists or Homoousions stood pre-eminent for ability, firmness and fidelity, the renowned Athanasius. This great champion of catholicism, the most distinguished among the Fathers of the church, not by his writings only, but by his adventures and his sufferings, steadily defended the Nicene doctrine during forty-six years of alternate dignity and persecution. He succeeded Alexander in the See of Alexandria in the year 326; he succeeded also to his enmity against the opinions and person of Arius, and boldly raised his voice against his recall from banishment by Constantine. Some intemperance in his zeal seems soon after to have given a pretext to the Asiatic Bishops, many of whom were still Arian; and in the Synod, held at Tyre (335), they pronounced against him the sentence of degradation and exile, which was enforced by the Emperor. At the end of twenty-eight months, soon after the death of Constantine, he was restored; but in 341 he was once more exiled by the Synod of Antioch, acting under the influence of Constantius. The place of his former banishment was France; that of his second was Italy, and chiefly Rome; so that he became familiar with the language of the West, with the discipline and primates of its church, and with the court of its Emperor. He profited by all these advantages, and availed himself so effectually of the last, that Constans, at length, prepared to interfere with arms in his favor. Threatened by the horrors of a religious war, Constantius reluctantly consented to his restoration. In the year 349 he re-occupied his former throne. The entrance of the Archbishop into his capital was a triumphal procession. Absence and persecution had endeared him to the Alexandrians; his authority, which he exercised with rigor, was more firmly established, and

Digitized by Google

his fame was diffused from Ethiopia to Britain, over the whole extent of the Christian world.

"It was immediately after this event that Constantius succeeded to the Western Empire; and in his zeal for the propagation of Arianism he presently renewed his attack on Athanasius. He summoned councils of the Western Bishops; he menaced and caressed and corrupted the Bishops whom he had summoned, and at length, (in the year 356), succeeded in deposing for the third time his spiritual adversary.....This banishment lasted six years, until the death of his persecutor, (362). These years were passed in the deserts of Upper Egypt, in concealmant and dependence; and they were consoled by the pious exertions of the exile for the opinions for which he suffered—exertions which the vigilance of the Imperial police could neither prevent nor neutralize. After his final restoration he enjoyed his See without interruption for eleven years, and, at length, died in peace and dignity."—(Waddington, Ch. Hist. p. 95-7.)

The life of this great man was in the spirit of the old martyrs. He contended for the faith against Imperial power, and came off conqueror. Constantius was the "protector and proselyte of the Semi-Arians, and gave to their party all the support of his throne. St. Jerome says of his reign: 'The whole world groaned and wondered to find itself Arian." Contemporaneously, Valens, in the Eastern Empire, gave his sanction and countenance to the Arians—so that its profession was common, and in some of the Asiatic Provinces, especially Syria, was perhaps openly avowed by the majority. Still, both in the West and in the East the Athanasian doctrine struggled fearlessly against the influence of power, and held the sway over the best and truest of the church. "At Antioch, at least, the dissent of the people for the established Arianism was strongly and violently expressed, and at Constantinople itself, the very citadel of the heresy, in spite of the savage edicts of Constantius, some very sanguinary tumults still proved the steady perseverance of many Catholics, or Anti-Arians. In one of these 3,150 persons were killed." All the influence of Valens could not prevent similar tumults in the East, and at the end of his reign, (A. D. 378), Arianism began to yield to the steady resistance and aggressions of the profounder faith.

The accession of Theodosius the Great, (380), was the turning point in the struggle. He declared for the doctrine of Nice, and

Digitized by Google

issued at once a decree for its establishment among his subjects. He called the council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, which was the second oecumenical council—and through it, reannounced the doctrine of the Homoousion. This council was composed of 150 Bishops, and, though they were convened with especial reference to the "Macedonian" heresy, concerning the Holy Spirit. yet they reproduced, in fuller form, the Nicene doctrine of the trinity, and the essential unity of the God-head. To this announcement Theodosius gave immediate and firm support. "I will not permit," said he to certain Arians, A. D. 383, "throughout my domains, any other religion than that which obliges us to worship the Son of God in unity of essence with the Father and Holy Spirit, in the adorable Trinity. As I hold the Empire of Him, and the power which I have to command you, he likewise will give me strength, as he has given me the will, to make myself obeyed in a point so necessary to your salvation, and to the peace of my subjects."—(Wadd. Ch. Hist. p. 99). This inaugurated the ecclesiastic triumph of this doctrine. Though many respectable parties have since held the doctrine of Arius, the Nico-Constantinopolitan Symbol has been unceasingly maintained and acknowledged as the creed, both of the Western and Eastern church down to the present day.

Before we dismiss the subject, it is proper that I shall say a few words on the Nicene doctrine of eternal generation. I am not sure that it is held, or indeed understood by many christians of the present day. To understand this doctrine it is necessary to distinguish between the generation of *Person* and the generation of the *Essence*. The generation of the essence would be destructive of the Divine Unity, and result in Tritheism—or Polytheism. Again, we must distinguish between *generation* and *creation*, lest we fall into the error of considering the *generation* of a *person* the same thing as the *origination* of a creature—*de nihilo*. This would degrade the Son into a creature—different from God, and without essential Divinity. These distinctions were insisted on by Athanasius and others. The Divine Essence is distinct from a Divine Person.

In what did they distinguish eternal generation from creation?

1. Eternal generation is an *offspring* out of the eternal essence of God; creation is the origination of a new essence from nothing.

2. Eternal generation is the *communication* of an *eternal* essence; creation is the origination of a *temporal* essence.

Digitized by Google

3. That which is eternally generated is of one essence with the generator; but that which is created is of another essence from that of the Creator. The substance of God the Son is one and identical with the substance of God the Father; but the substance of a creature is diverse from that of the Creator. The Father and Son are one Nature, and one Being; God and the world are two Natures and two Beings.

4. Eternal generation is necessary; but Creation is optional. The filiation of the Second Person in the Trinity is grounded in the Nature of Deity; but the origination of the world depends entirely upon arbitrary will. It is as necessary that there should be Father and Son in the God-head, as that the God-head should be eternal, or self-existent; but there is no such necessity for Creation.

5. Eternal generation is an immanent perpetual activity in an ever-existing essence; Creation is an instantaneous act, and supposes no elements of the creature in existence.

It will be seen that the ideas of time and contingency are excluded from that of eternal generation—so that it is the "communication of the one eternal essence of deity by the First Person to the Second Person, in a manner ineffable, mysterious, and abstracted from all earthly and human peculiarities.

The terms Father and Son are correlates—one hypothesis supposes and requires the other. "In human generation," says Pearson, "though the Son is begotten in the same nature with the Father, yet the Father necessarily precedes the Son in time; but the Divine generation is not in time, and there is no temporal precedence. Human generation is corporeal and by decission of substance; but divine generation is incorporeal and by total and plenary communication of the entire essence."

The relation of the Father and Son is conceived, not under difference of essence, but of *hypostatical character*. As to substance they are one—of entire and perfect equality, of course, because the *same;* but as to *Person*, they admit of the conception of mutual relationship, and so of subordination. The Father is first, the Son, second—in hypostatical character. They are one in nature, essence, substance, and equal and identical.

Arguing this question in his "Orations against the Arians" Athanasins says:

We must not understand those words, "I am in the Father and

Digitized by Google

the Father in me," as if the Father and Son were two distinct essences or natures, blended or inlaid into one another; as if they had that property which philosophers call penetration of parts; that is to say, as if they were a vessel, supposed to be capable of being doubly filled at once; as if the Father occupied the same quantity or region of space with the Son, and the Son the same as the Father. The Father's personality is infinitely perfect and complete, and the Son's personality is the plenitude of his Father's substance. The Son has not his Sonship derived or communicated to him by any sort of intervention, or mediation. No; it is of the Son's very nature, of the Father's substance, and immediate from the Father.....There is an entire propriety and community of nature between the Son and the Father, in like manner as there is between brightness and light, between the stream and the fountain; and consequently he that sees the Son sees in him the Father, and cannot but know that the Son is in the substance of the Father, as having his *subsistence* (ὑποστασις) communicated to him out of that substance (ο σια); and again, that the Father is in the Son, as communicating his substance to the Son, as the nature of the solar substance is in the rays, the intellectual faculty in the rational soul, and the very substance of the fountain in the waters of the rivers.....The Son cannot be otherwise than begotten of the Father, and consequently cannot be the Father; yet, as being *begotten* of the Father he cannot but be God; and as being God, he cannot but be one in essence with the Father; and therefore, he and the Father are one, one in propriety and community of nature, and one in unity of Godhead. Thus brightness is light; the splendor or radiance of the Sun is co-eval with the body of the Sun. It is of its very substance.....Both being one in essence and divinity, it follows that whatever can be affirmed of the Father may as truly and properly be affirmed of the Son, *except only the relation of Paternity.* That the Son is co-eternal with the Father is evinced by the very nature of the relation of the Son-ship. For no one is father of a son, nor can in a physical sense be called so, until he has a son. The relationship of artist or workman does not necessarily imply a co-existence of mechanical works or productions with their maker; and therefore, it does not follow that God could not be a Creator, before the existence of his creatures. *But he could not be a Father before he had a Son of his very substance; and, there-*

Digitized by Google

fore, his Paternity must have been co-eternal with the God-head.—"Cyril of Alexandria says :" "The generation of the Son did not *precede* his existence, but he always existed, and that by generation."—(See Shedd. i. p. 336—seq.). W. K. P.

ON THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

"It is one of the marvelous facts in Christ's history that he distinctly foreboded the calamities which were to befall him. Evil did not come upon him unawares; its pressure and its bitterness were aggravated by anticipation. No explanation is here offered of this fact, and nothing will be built upon it in the way of argument, but it stands with great distinctness in the narrative.—'From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.'[1] In harmony with this he forewarned his disciples: 'Ye shall be hated of all men for my name's sake.'[2] 'They shall put you out of the synagogues; yea, the time cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.'[3] In the garden of Gethsemane, he said to those who were with him, 'Behold, the hour cometh, and the Son of Man is betrayed into the hands of sinners, Rise, let us be going: behold he is at hand that doth betray me.'[4] When Judas with the band of soldiers drew near, 'Jesus knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazereth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he.'[5] If Christ was gifted, whether naturally or supernaturally, with anything of the insight into the future which these passages suppose, at least no one will doubt that its effect must have been to render the burden of calamity many times more crushing. But, leaving this debated ground, we must repeat the fact already referred to for a different purpose—that Christ was literally alone in his sufferings, unsupported by a single human mind. Courage and faith are not unusual, when the principles that call them forth have been adopted by others, and have received this decisive proof of their adaptation and their truth. That which is true, indeed,

1Matthew, xvi. 21 2Matthew, x. 22. 4Matthew, xxvi, 45, 46.
3John, xvi. 2 5John. xviii. 4, 5.

Digitized by Google

is not more true by being understood and admitted, and what a man believes is not really more worthy of his belief than before, when it is accepted by others as well as himself. But mind leans on mind, nevertheless, and the enlightened convictions of one impart increased stability and strength to the enlightened convictions of another. What we could not effect or endure alone, we can effect and endure when supported by other kindred souls.—Jesus knew no such support as this. He was followed indeed by multitudes, but it was not because they understood and embraced his principles; and hence, when these principles were more fully disclosed, 'many went back and walked no more with him.'1 Even his own relatives had no intelligent faith in him, and his own chosen disciples gave to him their affections rather than their judgments. They devotedly loved his personal character, they believed in his greatness, but they did not comprehend it; the new principles struggled in their minds with the old faith, but they never succeeded, while he lived, in completely displacing it. Hence, when he died, the disciples at the first spoke as if their hopes were overthrown forever. The plain fact is, that Jesus at the last disappointed his disciples, disappointed his own relations, disappointed the masses of the people, disappointed every one except himself. *He* was never disappointed, from the first to the last moment of his course. Without a single complete example of success while he lived, amid constant discouragements and apparent discomfiture, he calmly believed in the omnipotence of spiritual truth and in the divinity of his own mission.

Speedy triumph he did not and could not anticipate. With that profound and calm wisdom which we have already seen distinguished him, he could not fail to know, when he thought of the insidious and mysterious working of sin, and its almost indestructible *force*, that it must be long before it could be forever extirpated. When he saw human nature fallen from God, and darkened and diseased, he could not fail to know that its restoration, purification, education for immortality, and complete cure, must be a slow and protracted process. When he looked upon the vast empire of evil, the growth of thousands of years, its foundations strong and deep, and its ramifications innumerable, he could not fail to know that its entire and final overthrow must be the work of ages. Tremendous conflicts *must* precede such a triumph as

1John, vi. 60.

Digitized by Google

he anticipated; centuries of darkness and struggle *must* intervene. But he knew, at the same time, and was calmly assured of the perfect adaptation of spiritual truth to the spiritual condition of the world; and he saw in that truth, if the only, yet the sure provision for all the wants of men, if the only, yet the infallible, remedy for all the evils that preyed upon them.

'The spiritual nature within man, the spiritual world around and over him, the Uncreated Father of all, pardon of sin, ere long to receive all the elucidation and all the evidence of the cross, the regeneration of the soul and its reconciliation to God.'—These were the living, holy truths which Jesus announced; and in these, in their adaptation, their mighty force, and their certain triumph, his confidence was unmovable. But higher even than this he was able to ascend. From spiritual truth he rose to its author and fountain, God. He believed that his mission was of God, the purpose which he was unfolding and executing was God's, and the infinite resources of God were pledged to its realization. He looked to the universal providence which includes mind as well as matter, and to all its mighty combinations and agencies; he looked to the ever-flowing and inexhaustible fountain of spiritual influences, and to him whose knowledge, wisdom, and power are illimitable, and his confidence was untroubled and serene. In his whole life, no indication of doubt, even for a moment, can be discovered. Not a word of hesitation ever escaped his lips. When his last hour was approaching, his voice to his disciples was a voice of calm assurance. 'In the world ye shall have tribulation: but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'[1] 'Ye now have sorrow; but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.'[2] 'The world seeth me no more: but ye see me; because I live, ye shall live also. In that day ye shall know that I am in the Father, and you in me, and I in you.'[3] 'Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you: not as the world giveth, give I unto you. Let not your hearts be troubled, neither let them be afraid.'[4] With respect to the infallible success of his own mission, this was his language, 'I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me.'[5] 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations.'[6] At the Last Supper,

1John, xvi. 33. 2John, xvi. 22. 3Ib. xiv. 19, 20.
4Ib. xiv. 27. 5Ib. xii. 32. 6Matt. xxiv. 14.

Digitized by Google

when Judas Iscariot had gone out to confer with the Pharisees and Scribes, Jesus said, 'Now is the Son of man glorified, and God is glorified in him. If God be glorified in him, God w also glorify him in himself, and will straightway glorify him.'[1] When he stood before the council which condemned him, and when the high priest adjured him to tell if he *were* the Christ, he answered, 'Hereafter you shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.'[1] At that awful moment his faith was unconquerable.

This, then, is the state of the case, as a mere matter of history: A young man destitute of resources, of patronage, and of influence, commits himself to an enterprise which, so long as he lives, is not appreciated, or even understood. He is persecuted and scorned, deserted by his friends, betrayed by one of his diciples, falsely accused and condemned to a disgraceful and torturing death. But, alone, with death before him, and without one earthly support, he calmly believes that the enterprise shall triumph, and that *he* shall reign in the minds and hearts of men!

Can *it is* have only been human? Was there ever a manifestation of *mere humanity* like to this. Can anything short of the union of divinity with this humanity account for the acts and states of Christ's mind?

This is not all; the narrative offers some additional facts. At the Last Supper, Jesus told his disciples, as they sat around him, that the time of his death was near at hand. Were his confidence and courage shaken by this prospect? Did no fear disturb him—fear of the effect which his death might produce on the opinion of the world? Did not feelings of uneasiness rise within him as if after all he might fail? At all events, was he not anxious that the ignominious termination of his course might be concealed after he was gone! No, he was not; but, with perfect composure, he made provision that not only his death itself, but all its agony and its shame should never be forgotten while the world lasted. 'He took bread and gave it to the disciples, saying, this is my body broken for you; this do in remembrance of me. In like manner he took the cup, saying, this is my blood shed for you; this do in remembrance of me.'[2]

Was ever serenity like this? Can anything more touching, more

[1] John, xiii. 31, 32. [2] Mark, xiv. 62.
[3] Matthew, xxvi; Mark, xiv, Luke, xxii.

Digitized by Google

sublime than this be conceived? Was it ever heard of before or since, that a person, in the position of malefactor, took pains to preserve the memory of his disgraceful death? Jesus Christ, about to be crucified as a felon and a slave, commanded and provided that the fact should be remembered to the end of time—did so in the full confidence that he should at last triumph. And the fact *has been* remembered. This is the mystery—if he be not all that he claimed to be—this is truly more miraculous than anything ever so called, more inexplicable on all natural principles. The fact has been remembered for eighteen hundred years; it is remembered to this day; and it has been and is remembered, not as a form, a time-honored custom, but minds have been won to Christ—human hearts have been and are inviolably attached to him.

Christ's assurance of triumph is a historical fact, his actual triumph for nearly two thousand years is no less historically certain: the two combined lead to one conclusion only. It is this—*he* was, as he claimed to be, divine: his religion is divine, the only religion which contains the indubitable proof, and presents to the world a real incarnation of divinity—God *in* man."—*From Young's "Christ of History."*

BIBLE REVISION.

After the high wind of excitement on the subject of Bible revision, that passed over us from 1850 to 1860, a calm has followed, for which many general and special causes may be assigned, which it is not our intention here to name or to discuss. As the great and general interest among us, culminating during the above decade, did not suddenly spring out of the ground, but was the result of causes working for many years previous, so, we may rest assured, it is in like manner true, that the excitement and discussions on the question of Bible revision have not been in vain; that this question has advanced in understanding and interest in the public mind; and that permanent, important, advanced ground has been gained by the aggressive party, and very valuable ripe results are in near prospect,—if not all that is desired and yet hoped for, at least much very much beyond what was looked for a quarter of a century ago. But the battle has thus far been a

Digitized by Google

hard fought one, over a wide field, and of many years, and the end is not yet. Let us rejoice and take courage, and thank God for what has been achieved in one of the most important interests and controversies of our age. The development of this controversy in the Bible Union, is only a part of its history, that in its full extent stretches in time and space far beyond the special developments here. We have every reason, however, to believe, that the bold positions taken by the Bible Union, the clear formulating by it of the truths involved in the great controversy, the immense resources developed and the impulses given by the good warfare this Society waged, in its grand faithfulness and fearlessness in boldly relying upon and asserting truth,—have together constituted one of the most potent influences, all over the English world, in leading onward to the advanced positions now gained and permanently occupied on this question.

Twenty-five and thirty years ago, when the subject first began to be seriously discussed in our country, the conservative element of evangelical orthodoxy met it, as a solid body, with intense opposition;—the very thought was abhorrent; feeling, judgment, all rose in violent rebellion against it. And in this same manner this opposition continued, assuming its most decided form in its direct assaults on the Bible Union, denying not only the righteousness of the special position of the Society on the subject of revision, but even the necessity and propriety of any thorough revision at all,—indeed, we might almost say, of any revision whatever. Party spirit is very intense in this country, and by reason of this strong sect-life and sect-passion, there is vastly less freedom and boldness of religious thought here than in the old world. What in the old world, in the evangelical ranks, is allowed and accepted with all forbearance and liberty, as an unquestioned right, here awakens trembling alarm, opposition, and denunciation. This freedom of religious thought in Europe, resting upon enlightenment and the absence of the intensely narrow sect-trammels and sect-jealousies that reign and riot here, is a blessing to the religious world;—without it, we do not know what would become of us. This grand intellectual and spiritual freedom leads the *thought* of the religious world, and becomes in many most important directions, our teacher. We may have here, doubtless, religiously great advantages over those across the sea, but they are in many most important respects above us.

Digitized by Google

And now, the great Old World, in its best representatives as to piety and learning, is leading on in the work of revising the old common versions,—as on the continent, so in England. This is beginning to have its effect. It is instructive and edifying to note the difference in the tone now and years ago on the subject of revision, in the religious press of our land;—what then was intolerable, impious innovation, not for a moment to be thought of, is discovered to be quite reasonable and permissible now,—a thing proper and inevitable.

As an illustration,—the *N. Y. Observer*, the best representative of the strong, staid, conservative element of American evangelical orthodoxy, has stood forth as the most uncompromising foe of revision, objecting to any such movement. Yet, in a late number, in a prominent place, we find a paper of a very much different tone and tendency, by the Rev. J. A. Spencer, D. D.,—it is headed, "The English Bible." Read it,—and mark the tenor of it, and see how the wind is turning:

"During the last quarter of a century, there have been various efforts made to banish or do away with the Bible of 1611, and substitute in its place a new version. It has been asserted, and numerous illustrations have been brought forward to bear out the assertion, that the translation made in the reign of King James is full of errors; gross errors, it is affirmed, as to the meaning of the original, gross errors as to matters of taste, and even still more grievous errors in the retaining obsolete, unmeaning, improper, indecent words and expressions. The consequence has been that individuals, as well as one of the largest denominations of Christians in the land, have made new translations, especially of the New Testament, and the improvements in style, in accuracy, in refinement, and everything of the kind, have been published to the world, and any one who wishes can obtain these new versions and satisfy himself what the English Bible is, or ought to be, according to the views of those who have spent time and money in making a new one. Thus far, however, the old Bible holds its place, and seems likely to hold it, even if every denomination of Christians, and every man who is or thinks himself acquainted with Hebrew and Greek, in England or America, should set forth a new translation of the Holy Scriptures.

"Of late years, the question has assumed another shape. Few, if any, of those best fitted to judge, are urgent for an entirely new translation and a banishing of the old; but, it is asked, whether we shall hold on to the Bible of 1611, as it is, or subject it to a revision? Numbers of our best scholars and most learned divines are in favor of this plan of revision, or something like this. Many are disposed to advocate

Digitized by Google

the undertaking to do with the version of King James what was done substantially at the time our present version was issued; that is, diligently comparing and sifting native and foreign versions, carefully seeking all the aids of advanced scholarship, especially in Greek, made during the last two centuries, and going only so far as to correct manifest errors and to introduce such changes as necessity imperatively demands. From the action taken by the principal Convocation of the English Church, and from the disposition which appears to prevail among the authorities in Church and State, it is clear that the question is not only one of the gravest moment, in the estimation of English Christians, but it is one that seems not unlikely to lead to some positive, definite results.

"In view of the present position of affairs in the Christian world, and the steps which have already been taken, I am free to say, that, if a revision is a necessity,—if it must be had,—probably no better time can be found for entering upon the work than the present decade, 1870—1880. The spirit evinced in all directions in England, and measurably in our own country, is favorable to making the effort now, or as soon as it can be. The rulers of the Church in England show little or nothing of the contracted, sectarian spirit which some apprehended they would show, and which, it is almost certain, would be fatal in its result. On the contrary, there is a distinct recognition of the interest which all other Christians have in the work, and a determination to call upon them to contribute the aid of their learning and skill in correcting and revising the English Bible, and in freeing it from all blemishes and imperfections which mar its glorious majesty and power.

"For myself, I am constrained to avow that I do not yet feel absolutely certain that it is the best thing to be done just now to make this attempt. I freely acknowledge, indeed I know by my own study of the originals, that our translation has its imperfections, often serious imperfections. I know that in various places there are errors, grave errors they may even be termed. I am perfectly aware of the fact, that the study of the Greek language has progressed far beyond anything to which the translation of 1611 could aspire, and I can bear witness to the value and importance of this higher scholarship, especially in rendering many places in the Epistles of St. Paul. But after all, there comes before me the great incontestable certainty that in no one place or passage of the Bible, as it is, are the truth and efficiency of Christ's Gospel denied or covered up out of sight. The word of God, in all its essential power, in all its essential truth, in all its essential dignity and purity is here, in our hands,—is here, free, open to all, the glorious heritage of all who speak the English tongue; the Bible, printed by its hundreds of thousands, and circulated by its hundreds of thousands, year by year, amongst a hundred millions of people.

"I submit, then, for the consideration of the reader, whether, by a re-

Digitized by Google

vision, however well and judiciously made, the English Bible of 1611 can be displaced and set aside, and that universal assent and consent be obtained for the new which the old has had for more than 250 years. I submit, also, whether, in the existing condition of Christendom, it be impossible to secure anything like an agreement as to what revision is or ought to be, how far it should go, where it should stop, to what extent by new rendering it should effect established doctrines, and many like points to be settled. I do not, by any means, deny the possibility of meeting all difficulties and harmonizing all discrepancies and disputes; but I have, I confess, little hope or expectation of witnessing such a state of things very speedily. It is to be feared, from the wickedness of the age, the quarrelsome spirit prevailing, the laxity of principle, and the pride and self-will rife in the community, that there is no immediate prospect of a Millennial peace and concord among even professing Christians · and, therefore, I am not sanguine as to the success of this revision movement, now under way in England. Meanwhile, as a last word, I venture the suggestion that we all "hold fast that which is good,"—hold fast to the venerable and noble old English Bible, and wait patiently for the day when it shall become evident that a better and purer version of the original is offered for our acceptance."

Here we have the avowal, that "the spirit evinced in all directions in England, and measurably in our own country, is favorable to making the effort now, or as soon as it can be;"—two points admitted and accepted, that heretofore were persistently rejected, —the propriety of revision and that it be done now, and not in an indefinite future, as the voice of the people; the writer himself believes that, if it is to be done, there is no time better than the coming decade.

In view of this evident progress and change in public sentiment, let us learn ever to hope and be patient in the advocacy of what is unpopular, but true and just,—for truth is sure to win at last. We must not impatiently fret and give up the battle because men do not soon enough, as we think, accept our plea.— Also, however ineffectual and barren our labors to-day, let us never reckon any good and true work as done in vain;—we shall reap in due time if we faint not.

The writer of the above article, admits the now incontestable and very important fact, "that the study of the Greek language" —which is the ground of our confidence in a translation,—"has progressed far beyond anything to which the translation of 1611 could aspire;"—how, then, can it be possible to retain public,

Digitized by Google

general confidence in the faithfulness of that version,—a matter of such essential importance? or how can it be just to retain it still unchanged? Again, "But after all, there comes before me the great incontestable certainty, that in no place or passage of the Bible, as it is, are the truth and efficacy of Christ's Gospel denied or covered out of sight. The Word of God in all its essential power, in all its essential truth, in all its essential dignity and and purity, is here in our hands,—is here, free, open to all," &c. Such a statement as this is not exact truth, and requires a good deal of qualification. First, it is not enough "that the truth and efficacy of Christ's gospel in no one place or passage" should be denied or covered out of sight; we might be able to say this of a translation, and yet this alone would be but poor praise. It is not enough that the truth should not be denied and altogether covered up,—but it must of necessity be clearly brought out and affirmed, to be a true translation, representing God's Word, and answering to his purpose of "making *all men* see the length and the breadth, the height and the depth," of the riches of his truth and love to man; such a clear and full revelation of his Word in a translation, in a positive, affirmative form, is really essential to the enlightenment, and consequently salvation, of the world. It is not true that in a translation thus obscured, "the Word of God in all its essential power, &c., &c., is here free, open to all;" to scholars, to enlightened, capable students, it may be all this,—but these constitute but a fraction of "all" men, and there neither is, nor ought to be, and certainly by God is not designed to be, any exclusively privileged class of men in this respect. To the great majority of men the *full* truth must be *clearly* exposed, that they may be taught right, that they may have an equal chance with others. Semi-obscurity alone is fatal to simple, illiterate minds;—it bars the way to the truth with such minds and turns them easily into mistakes and errors, which may become very serious hindrances to the soul.

We have but little confidence, if any at all, in any general acceptance, or popular advantage, beyond an aid to scriptural study, of any translation at this day going forth from the hands of one man. Men demand, to insure their confidence in the result, the co-operation of many, and these properly qualified, in the work of the translation or revision of the Bible. It is quite vain to insist on men giving up this positive demand;—it will never be

Digitized by Google

done. No plea in that direction, no matter on what grounds made, will possibly succeed.

The English revisers will not give us *immerse* for baptize;—of that we may be sure. With their revision immersionists will still have to make this point a matter of *interpretation*, in the absence of an "authorized" translation, and that task is not a difficult one. Yet this forthcoming revision will certainly be a great gain, to be accepted with gratitude; false readings, archaisms, many incorrect translations, inaccuracies and obscurities of many kinds, will disappear, as we have every reason to hope. The revisers are not trammeled, as were those (for they were but revisers) of King James, and they have a different world as their judges from that of the seventeenth century.

Let us work and wait in patience. The hand of God is manifesting itself in many wonderful ways in our day. Progresses unlooked for in many directions are surprising and rejoicing the nations. And God will not fail in respect of his Word; it is His will that *that* too shall "not be bound." C. L. L.

"PLEA FOR UNION."

[I take pleasure in giving a cordial hearing to a free and candid discussion of Christian union. Let us have light—and if need be a revelation of what darkness still hovers over the subject. It is a great question—before the practical difficulties of which all good men blush and mourn. We have been preaching about it, and praying for it, lo, these many years. Shall we now draw back, when the spirit of the age seems bearing it on upon us, and refuse to hear the fullest expression which discussion can draw out, of the views of all? Surely not. Union must ultimately stand upon principle, but it must also live and walk by love. The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace—let us labor for this,—not repellently, but with the constant attraction of the faith that it is possible and right.—W. K. P.]

BRO. PENDLETON:—Will you permit me to encroach upon your valuable closing pages, with a few words in reply to the strictures of 'J. L.' in the October number of your paper? I would not ask this, except to correct a few apparently intentional misstate-

Digitized by Google

ments of my position by 'J. L.' For example, he denies the truth of my statement that "faith, repentance, baptism, the supper, prayer, assembling together," &c., were the distinguishing characteristics of the evangelical denominations, as well as of ourselves. Why was he not kind enough to point out *who* it is, that does not accept, teach and practice these things? We cited the *radical* differences between Jewish Christians and Gentile converts in apostolic days, to *prove* that there might be a difference as to *minor* matters, and yet an *unity* on the great essentials of Christianity;—and instead of meeting the issue, he attempts to evade and befog the question by showing that the council refused to impose upon the Gentile converts the burdens of the Jewish law—a proposition that no one *thought* even of denying. Next he finds a difference between ourselves and others in the frequency of the observance of the Lord's Supper. Will 'J. L.' favor us by pointing out the passage in the New Testament that tells us *when*, or *how often* the Supper must be eaten? He may refer us to the example of the apostles and the language employed in describing their meeting, as, "And upon the first day of the week the disciples came together to break bread," but we cannot accept this as equivalent to a command, and if we did, we deny that any thing *more* can be inferred from it, than that when they *did* celebrate the Supper, they selected the *first* day of the week for that purpose. It does not say they eat the Supper *every first* day of the week—though to be sure it is better for us to observe it each Lord's day, and err, if erring at all, on the right side. But without raising the question specially, permit me to ask 'J. L.' since he is such a stickler for "tithe, mint, anise and cummin," why he does not also eat the Lord's Supper *at night?* Whatever doubt there may be as to *frequency*, there is none at all as to the *time*,—for it is perfectly certain that the Supper was both *instituted* and *observed* at night; and I think, also, on Saturday night, since the Jewish days were from sunset to sunset, and hence the first day of the week began Saturday eve. 'J. L.' may reply that the time of day is of no consequence. O, no, certainly not in *our* case, or when *we* choose to use our discretion, but when others, as conscientious as ourselves, conclude that it need be eaten only periodically, we denounce them as unchristian and failing to observe the ordinances of the Lord's house. So, likewise, with baptism. *We* have changed it from *trine* immersion to

Digitized by Google

one immersion—from pools and rivers to baptisteries—and have no twinge of conscience whatever, but visit with the *severest condemnation* some poor, ignorant, but pious and devoted Methodist, who honestly believes that she has submitted to the ordinance of baptism in being sprinkled or poured. Had we not better cast out the beams from *our* own eyes, before usurping the province of an all-wise and just judge, and endeavoring to clear the vision of our fellow-workers in the Master's vineyard? If 'J. L.' can really see no difference between men *making* their *own* commands to obey, and honestly striving to obey what they conscientiously believe to have been commanded by God, it would be useless for me to attempt his enlightenment.

I wonder that 'J. L.' did not censure Mr. A. Campbell for his tolerance in preferring to call *brother* one whose conduct was *Christ-like*, to one whose conduct was not so Christ-like but yet agreed with him *fully* in doctrine:—or, that he did not find fault with Paul, who made it an occasion of rejoicing that "Christ was preached," although by some through contention, and by others who thought to add affliction to his bonds by so doing. Perhaps he may again bring his censorial pen into action, to reprove Bro. Richardson, who has just written an article on "union" for the *Standard* of Dec. 24, in which article he expresses sentiments almost identical with those expressed in the article to which 'J. L.' takes such umbrage.

Won't 'J. L.' tell us, when he writes again, "where was the church of Christ" before we had an existence as an organization? I am fearful that should he do so, he will have to admit that there *has been* a "church of Christ" ever since Christ founded it, and therefore that we cannot be *exclusively* that church. In your admirable article on the "Trinity," you state that the apostles' creed was the formula of faith of the apostolic churches. Per contra, then, the church subscribing to that creed and yielding implicit assent to its tenets, must have been a "Christian" church. But all the Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, as well as ourselves, can adopt the creed *fully* in all its statements as honestly and truthfully as did the churches in ancient days—and hence, it follows, that they are all *Christian* churches. Will not 'J. L.' hunt the fallacy of the syllogism? In the mean time I take courage and thank God that I am neither *alone* nor *peculiar* in my views. The movement headed by Bro. Errett,

Digitized by Google

looking toward an union of the Baptists and Disciples; the universal commendation of it by all papers and ministers of note; Bro. Richardson's article on union, before referred to; the scattered utterances of religious papers and distinguished ministers; all these, like bubbles rising to the surface of the stream, from some object hidden beneath, are indicative of the earnest hopes and desires in the hearts of all good men, for the "union" of God's people in every land, upon the *broad* foundation laid by his son Jesus Christ, and stated by Peter, to wit, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Let 'J. L.' draw his little partisan circle around him and refuse to move, if he choose, but he cannot arrest the impetus already given to the religious world. Slowly, grandly, surely and gradually are we swinging round to occupy the *only* foundations upon which the religious world can unite, and the multiplying indications are so many gleams of light giving us warning of the approach of the full light of that *glorious* day, when under the one banner of religious tolerance and liberty, we can present an *united* and invincible front to the infidel world. That God may hasten the consummation of so desirable a result, should be the burden of all good men's prayers. 'L.'

SYMPATHY WITH THE POPE.

Since the king of Italy has taken possession of Rome, and thus deprived the pope of his temporal dominion,—the so-called "patrimony of St. Peter,"—leaving him simply a spiritual monarchy, addresses of sympathy with the fallen pontiff and of indignant protest against "the outrage" committed upon him, have been sent to him by the faithful from all parts of the Catholic world. This is what we had reason to expect, and the king of Italy himself, we presume, has not been disappointed in this manifestation of feeling. Still, this event, in the face of past history so wonderful and momentous, has by no means awakened the universal interest and excitement in the Catholic world that might have been looked for. In the past it would have been far otherwise; but that past has gone forever. While a large number of Catholics, in Europe and America, have loudly protested, there are other great numbers, perhaps the majority, who seem to take

Digitized by Google

the event even now, when it is yet new, with much composure, if not indifference;—and such is the character and current of events now, and such the nature of the human mind, Catholic as well as Protestant, that, the end of the pope's temporal monarchy being once a definitively accomplished fact, it would gradually be acquiesced in, even by the mass of the faithful, as irrevocable, precisely as they have yielded to other, and even greater, deprivations of papal power,—such as his dominion over kings and princes of the earth, once so potent and terrible, and regarded so essential to his divine power and dignity. A series of important events have, in a very immediate and direct way, contributed powerfully to this want of a universal, deep sympathy with the pope in his fall. These we will note.

First are the great revolutions and changes going on in some of the most powerful Catholic countries, immediately preceding this event,—in all of which the pope arrayed himself against the tide of the popular feeling and will. This he did, first of all, in Italy, where, after a moment of fair pretenses, he soon and finally, in 1848 and 1849, turned his back violently against the mighty current of popular feeling and action in behalf of liberal reforms and the unity of Italy. He lost the public heart of Italy,—and most of all, of Rome itself,—by this act of treachery and folly. In the struggle in Mexico, his sympathies, in an undisguised way, were, of course, also with the power and movement that sought to overthrow the republic and place a Hapsburg on the throne. In the wonderful peaceful revolution that has been going on in Austria, following the events of 1866, the pope again most violently arrayed himself against the strong, universal and successful uprising of the popular feeling, including the emperor and the entire nation, in behalf of liberal institutions. Here, too, he utterly failed, had to yield every one of his haughty pretensions, and so lost the popular heart of that great Catholic country, that had been so long the stay of his throne. Then followed the uprising in Spain, that other most Catholic land, and so long a bulwark of the papacy, by which the bigot queen was driven from her throne, and the nation emancipated itself from the old, destructive dominion of bigoted monarchs and priestcraft. In this struggle, again, of course, the pope fought bitterly against the rising tide of popular freedom, and here, too, again he has signally failed; for, besides the great points gained in behalf of civil and religious free-

Digitized by Google

dom, to the signal overthrow of papal power there, there has been elevated to the Spanish throne a son of the very Victor Emmanuel that has taken from the pope his "patrimony," and that has been by his Holiness cursed as the most impious of men. Then, to crown all these successive acts of insane folly, and to fill up the full measure of his wicked presumptions against the liberties of men and nations, came the calling of the ecumenical council, and the deliberate, blind, passionate determination, against the earnest protest of the most enlightened men of the Catholic world, both ecclesiastics and laymen, to have himself declared infallible,—an impious, God-defying presumption, and a perpetual menace to the governments and nations of the earth. The Catholic governments stand as a unit against this new, amazing arrogance, by which this weak mortal has with most impious pride sought to claim the very faculties of God himself.

Thus, within the brief space of less than twenty-five years, has the Roman Pontiff succeeded effectually, by a succession of his own evil acts, in alienating from himself, as perhaps no pope ever did before, and in these very critical days, the regard and sympathies of a great part of the Catholic world, and above all, of so many of the Catholic men of intellectual, social and political leadership. Then, finally, there has suddenly come upon Europe the tremendous war between France and Prussia, overwhelming with ruin the military protector of Rome, forcing the evacuation of Rome by the French army, and so engaging the minds and armies of Europe, as to leave no space for such attention to the pope's troubles as more peaceful days would most likely have called forth;—for, for ourselves, we have but little doubt that not only Napoleon, but King William also, would have protested,—and the the latter more likely than the former,—against the occupation of Rome by Victor Emmanuel; and it is not altogether unlikely that such effort in behalf of the pope may yet be made, and from that quarter,—with what success time will show.

Some of these addresses have come from our own country, as honest and as full of real sympathy and earnest protest, we suppose, as those received from any other quarter by the pope. The Catholics sincerely in their religious faith look up to the pope as their great spiritual father, and we must not be surprised or offended at their reverence, and their affection and sympathy for him. There are, however, some things in these addresses, ema-

Digitized by Google

mating as they do from our fellow-citizens, that cannot but arrest the attention and awaken the solicitude of the American people, Catholic as well as non-Catholic. We select, as a good specimen, the address sent out "by the clergy, both secular and regular, with their faithful people," of the diocese of New York. It is as follows:

"*Most Holy Father:*—The Catholic Clergy of the Diocese of New York, both secular and regular, together with their faithful people, approach the foot of your Apostolic throne, and offer your Holiness in the present trying time this avowal of their homage and obedience to the See of Peter, of their filial affection and spiritual allegiance, and devoting to your august person, so inexpressibly dear to them, and of their sympathy with you in the afflictions and outrages to which you, and in you the Holy Catholic Church, as the Holy Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, are at present subjected by faithless and unworthy members of that Church, whose supreme pastor you are. With the indignation of honest men, who respect no less the obligations of laws and treaties than the rights of nations and legitimate rulers; with the just and religious abhorrence of Christians who revere the sacred sovereignty of the Holy See over its temporal domain, we repudiate and condemn the lawless injustice which has invaded your domain as a Sovereign Prince.

"We also denounce the sacrilegious violence which has assaulted and brought under captivity the sacred person of your Holiness, the Vicar of Jesus Christ upon earth, and as such entitled by Divine right to complete liberty in the exercise of your sublime office, and of the most perfect of human rights to civil princedom, a necessary safeguard and bulwark to that liberty.

"We also protest against the invasion of the liberty of the Church in the person of its head, both as an outrage against the sacred prerogative of your Holiness as Supreme Pontiff, and as a violation of the right which we as Catholics possess, of being governed by a chief completely exempted from and independent of all civil authority, for in no other condition could our intercourse with him be free and unrestricted.

"In the full sincerity of our loyal and Catholic hearts, we promise to continue faithful to your Holiness and to the Apostolic See at all times, but especially in periods when distress and trouble like the present oppress the Church. We ask your Holiness to accept the assurance that we will not cease from making every effort in our power to aid and assist you in the maintenance of

Digitized by Google

your just rights, and in the fulfillment of your arduous duties, and that we will continually pray to God with a confidence greatly strengthened by the example which your Holiness has never failed to set before us, that he will deign to give you and the See of Peter another triumph more signal and illustrious than any of the past victories of the Church over the gates of hell and the powers of darkness.

"Finally, we humbly implore the prayer of your Holiness for steadfastness in the faith, and our clerical salvation, and your Apostolic benediction upon the divine of New York, and upon each and every one of us, your devoted children."

It is a deep shame to hear enlightened American citizens, as some are who signed these addresses, declare, in the most humble and fervent way, their ardent wishes for the restoration of the pope to his temporal dominion, and avowing that "they will not cease from making every effort in their power to aid and assist him in maintaining his just rights,"—that is, to regain his throne. Were the papal government a model of wisdom, justice, prosperity and freedom, the reverence of these Catholics for the pope as a temporal ruler might be justified. The simple fact that they sympathize with a king, can of itself alone not condemn them with Americans, very many of whom have at times shown a good deal of reverence for monarchs. Even now a good proportion of the American press is constantly sending up thick volumes of incense smoke to one of the most intensely monarchical of kings, with whom republicanism is a folly, an absurdity, and a crime against heaven and earth, and who with pious indignation rejects as impious, the doctrine that the rulers of nations rule by the will of the people, and are responsible to them, holding that their right as sovereigns is immediate from God, no human hand or will intervening, and that to him alone they are responsible, and he alone can take their right from them,—a monarch who, ere he ascended the throne even, subdued republicanism with sword, bayonet and cannon, wherever he could reach it Americans who burn incense to this king by the grace of God alone, will not blame American Catholics for sympathizing with a fallen *king*, simply, and wishing his return to his lost throne.

The world knows what this papal rule has been for ages, what it has been in our own day, and why the Romans were so ready to throw it off. No Jesuitic ingenuity can blot out or weaken the

Digitized by Google

telling fact, that at the plebiscitum, with a unanimity and universality almost unexampled, the city of Rome voted *against* the pope, and for the king of Italy. Pio Nono can never recover from the force of this vote. It is a condemnation of the most terrible character written upon the front of the papal government, by his own people, those whom he always called his "dear children." We have nowhere found a briefer, more truthful or more vigorous description of the utter worthlessness and abominableness of the papal government, than in the words of the good, brave, honest Seume, the German poet, addressed by him to the magnates of Rome. We give them in his own vigorous Latin,—they are worth remembering. He thus pours forth his indignation: "Nil valent apud Vos leges, nil justitia; nil mores; sagiuantur sacerdotes, perit plebs; cæcutit populus; vilipenditur quodcumque est homini sanctum, honestas, modestia, omnis virtus. Infimus et improbissimus quisque cum armis per oppida et agros prædabundus incedit, furatur, rapit, trucidat, jugulat, incendia miscet.. Hæc est illa religio scilicet, auctoris ignominia, rationis, oppropriium, qua Vos homines liberos et viros fortes ad servitia et latrones detrudere conamini."* This is no exaggeration, and gives but an incomplete idea of the utter weakness, worthlessness and corruption of the papal government. This is what these spiritual servants and subjects of the pope, pray to be restored to him, promising to do their utmost to bring about that end.

These American signers, here in the most distinct manner announce their devotion to the anti-American doctrine of the union of church and State;—this conclusion from their words they cannot avoid. If the Catholic Church as represented and embodied in the pope, needs for its independence temporal as well as spiritual power at Rome, then by a very easy and necessary transition, it so needs it elsewhere. Indeed, there is no possible successful evasion by the Catholics, of the notorious fact, that the

* "Here in Rome neither laws, nor justice, nor morals have any power; the priests fatten, and the people die of hunger. The masses are kept in blindness; whatever is sacred to men, probity, purity,—every virtue, is held in low esteem. The basest and most villainous roam about freely with arms, through town and country, stealing, robbing, murdering, assassinating, burning. And this is that religion, the reproach of its author and the opprobrium of reason, by which you seek to reduce free and brave men to slaves and robbers."

Digitized by Google

pope and the church have always claimed such a union, and denounced the separation. This is history, and Catholics cannot carry out the doctrines of the church and their devotion to the pope without involving themselves, as in the present case, in this conclusion,—the union of church and State. In the most positive and direct manner the separation of church and State is condemned by the pope in his *Syllabus*. Among the *errors* there denounced is the following (sect. 6, no. 55): "The church is to be separated from the State and the State from the church."—There it is,—as brief and plain as possible. All Catholics must accept this, in accepting the pope.

Again, and more distinct still,—in the third paragraph of this address, the signers declare that they "possess the right, as Catholics, of being governed by a chief *completely exempted from and independent of all civil authority*, for in no other condition could their intercourse with him be free and unrestricted." (Italics ours.) First, how do these Catholics, bishops, and astute, learned lawyers like O'Connor and McKeon,—for their names are to the paper,—answer the fact that, although, as they say, the papacy has existed since Peter, the popes had no such temporal sovereignty for about 800 years?

But, the real point is this, that the Catholic religion demands, as an essential condition of its true life and character, that its administration in its high functionaries shall be "exempted from and independent of all civil authority." If the pope assumes no prerogatives and authority in conflict with the rights of the temporal powers of the earth, why this exemption needed?—why must he have a "civil princedom, as a necessary safeguard and bulwark of his liberty?" Again, if in any respect this desired "freedom" is most necessary, it is not so much in the conception and issuing of papal decrees, as in executing them; the latter belongs to the episcopate and other subordinate functionaries of the Catholic church. Now, if the exemption from and indepe .dence of all civil authority is thus necessary for the pope, in like manner, and more so, is it for his clergy. Is it not just as necessary for the free and unrestricted intercourse between the clergy and the people of any district, province, state or kingdom, with their chief ecclesiastical superior in that district, state or kingdom, that this superior should always be thus "exempt from and independent of all civil authority?" And this is preiseely the old doc-

Digitized by Google

trine, so long fought for by the Catholic church, and precisely that which has brought it into conflict with governments and society. To illustrate this, we shall cite the directest kind of proof, the declarations in the most formal manner, of the present pope himself. That the papal authority claims, to-day, to stretch beyond matters of faith and morals, is declared in the following passage in the Encyclical of Dec. 8th, 1864:

"We cannot pass over in silence the audacity of those, who, not enduring sound doctrine, maintain that 'conduct and obedience can be refused, without sinning and without damage to the Catholic profession, to those decisions and decrees of the Apostolic See, which, as has been positively declared, concern the general good of the church, its rights and its discipline, so long as these (i. e. the decrees, &c.,) do not involve the dogmas of faith and morals.' How much this doctrine is opposed to the dogma of the plenary power divinely granted to the Roman pontiff by Christ the Lord, of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal church, every one can clearly see and understand."

Again, the pope in this Encyclical says to the bishops:

"Teach, that kingdoms rest on the foundation of the Catholic faith.....Cease not to teach, that the royal power is not granted, merely for the government of this world, but especially as a protection to the church; and nothing can be more advantageous and glorious for the rulers of States, and kings, than, as our most wise and most bold predecessor, St. Felix, wrote to the emperor Zeno,—'to let the Catholic church live according to its laws, and allow no one an attack on its freedom.....For it is certainly advantageous to these rulers, when it concerns the cause of God, according to his ordination, to subject their will to the Priests of Jesus Christ, and not to prefer it to them."

In the *Syllabus*, of same date, the following doctrines are condemned as errors:

"The church has not the power of using force (vis inferendæ), nor has any direct or indirect temporal power."—"The ecclesiastical tribunal for the temporal civil and criminal cases of the clergy is to be abolished, even without consultation, and against the reclamation, of the Apostolic See"—"In a conflict between the laws of the two powers, the temporal must take precedence."

From these quotations of supreme authority in the Catholic church, it is quite clear, that this "exemption from and indepen-

Digitized by Google

dence of the civil power" is claimed *not simply* for the pope, but that the pope claims it for the *church*, in its administrators everywhere. This then is Catholic doctrine, and this is advocated in the address of American citizens to the pope.

While these American citizens are thus joining with the blind devotees of Rome elsewhere in deploring, in this abject way, the loss of the temporal power of the pope, the brave Hyacinthe, in a letter dated Paris, July 19th, 1870, written to J. Massari, a member of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, says in grand prophetic words: "Unexpected events are impending, political events of immense reach, which will have their rebound in the sphere of religious affairs.....The temporal power of the popes, the general illusion of the liberal Catholics of France, and the blind passion of ultramontane Catholics of all countries, the secret cause—no, I mistake, the evident, palpable, avowed cause—of all that has been done at Rome in these last days,—the temporal power,—shall be destroyed or profoundly changed." And in this prospect the brave Carmelite rejoices, while these Americans, in abject bondage of soul, mourn and execrate the fulfillment of it!

We conclude this with a passage from the celebrated speech of Mr. L. Cass, delivered in the United States Senate, May 5, 1854, on the subject of "Religious Freedom Abroad," in the course of which he reviewed the religious intolerance in various parts of Italy, embracing also the pope's government at Rome. Archbishop Hughes had, in a public letter, censured Mr. Cass for his course on this subject in the Senate, and defended the intolerant laws of Florence and of Rome. In concluding his speech Mr. Cass said:

"And does Archbishop Hughes believe that all these abuses are destined to continue, untouched and unchanged? That they will much longer resist the mighty tide of public opinion, which has already done so much in these our latter days, and is fated to do so much more? It may not be. The past is a pledge for the future. Within the memory of the present generation the abuse of ages seemed to possess an impregnable fortress, occupying its position in the midst of Christianity and civilization, and overlooking and overawing both. But one after another its outworks have fallen before the efforts of truth, and ere long the citadel itself will be leveled to the ground. And are the representatives of the American people to lay their hands on their mouths, and their

Digitized by Google

months in the dust, to look on and see the persecutions and oppressions to which their countrymen are exposed abroad, and not even express their displeasure and their demand?.....I trust no such humiliation is in store for us."

Noble words these, and prophetic, and the prophecy is fulfilled! The outrges on American citizens in Italy and Rome have come to an end; "the *citadel itself*,"—the temporal power,—"has been leveled to the ground;" and all *true* Americans, and all friends of freedom, will rejoice! C. L. L.

CULTIVATING CHRISTIAN LOVE.

There are two methods by which we may cultivate Christian love.

1. By doing acts which love demands. It is God's merciful law that feelings are increased by acts done on principle. If a man has not the feeling in its warmth, let him not wait till the feeling comes. Let him act with such feeling as he has; with a cold heart if he has not got a warm one; it will grow warmer while he acts. You may love a man merely because you have done him benefits, and so become interested in him, till interest passes into anxiety, and anxiety into affection. You may acquire courtesy of feeling at last, by cultivating a courteous manner. The dignified politeness of the last century forced man into a kind of unselfishness in small things, which the abrupter manners of to-day will never teach. And say what men will of rude sincerity, those old men of urbane manners were kinder at heart with real good will, than we are with that rude bluffness which counts it a loss of independence to be courteous to any one. Gentleness of manner had some influence on gentleness of heart. So, in the same way, in things spiritual. If our hearts are cool, and we find it hard to love God and be affectionate to men, we must begin with duty. Duty is not Christian liberty. We are free only when we are in love with what we are to do, and those to whom we do it. Let a man begin in earnest with—I ought,—he will end, by God's grace, if he persevere, with the free blessedness of —I will. Let him force himself to abound in small offices of kindliness, attention, affectionateness, and all those for God's

Digitized by Google

sake. By and by he will feel them become the habit of his soul. By and by, walking in the conscientiousness of refusing to retaliate when he feels tempted, he will refuse to wish it: doing good and heaping kindness on those who injure him, he will learn to love them. For he has spent a treasure there: "And where the treasure is, there will the heart be also."

2. The second way of cultivating Christian love is by contemplating the love of God. You cannot move the boat from within; but you may obtain a purchase from without. You cannot create love in the soul by force from within itself; but you may move it from a point outside itself. God's Love is the point from which to move the soul. Love begets love. Love believed in, produces a return of love: we cannot love because we must. "Must" kills love; but the law of our nature is that we love in reply to love. No one ever yet hated one whom he believed to love him truly. We may be provoked by the pertinacity of an affection which asks what we cannot give; but we cannot hate the true love which does not ask, but gives. Now, this is the central truth of Christ's Gospel: we love Him because He first loved us. "Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." "God is love."

It is the one, almost only struggle of religious life, to believe this. In spite of all the seeming cruelties of this life; in spite of the clouded mystery in which God has shrouded Himself; in spite of pain, and the stern aspect of human life, and the gathering of thicker darkness and more solemn silence round the soul as life goes on, simply to believe that God is Love, and to hold fast to that, as a man holds on to a rock with a desperate grip when the salt surf and the driving waves sweep over him and take the breath away,—I say that is the one fight of Christian life, compared with which all else is easy. When we believe that, human affections are easy. It is easy to be generous and tolerant and benevolent, when we are sure of the Heart of God, and when the little love of this life, and its coldnesses, and its unreturned affections are more than made up to us by the certainty that our Father's Love is ours. But when we lose sight of that, though but for a moment, the heart sours, and men seem no longer worth the loving: and wrongs are magnified, and injuries cannot be forgiven, and life itself drags on, a mere death in life. A man may doubt anything and everything, and still be blessed, provided on-

Digitized by Google

ly he holds fast to that conviction. Let all drift from him like seaweed on life's ocean. So long as he reposes on the assurance of the eternal faithfulness of the Eternal Charity, his spirit at least cannot drift. There are moments, I think, when we understand those triumphant words of St. Paul, "Let God be true, and every man a liar."—*Robertson.*

"I SHALL BE SATISFIED."—PSA. 17: 15.

Not here! not here! Not where the sparkling waters
Fade into mocking sands as we draw near;
Where in the wilderness each footstep falters—
"I shall be satisfied;" but O! not here!

Not here—where all the dreams of bliss deceive us,
Where the worn spirit never gains its goal;
Where, haunted ever by the thought that grieves us,
Across us floods of bitter memory roll.

There is a land where every pulse is thrilling
With rapture earth's sojourners may not know,
Where heaven's repose the weary heart is stilling,
And peacefully life's time-tossed currents flow.

Far out of sight, while yet the flesh enfolds us,
Lies the fair country where our hearts abide,
And of the bliss is nought more wondrous tolds us
Than these few words—"I shall be satisfied."

Satisfied! satisfied! The spirit's yearning
For sweet companionship with kindred minds—
The silent love that here meets no returning—
The inspiration which no language finds—

Shall they be satisfied? The soul's vague longing—
The aching void which nothing earthly fills?
O! what desires upon my soul are thronging
As I look upward toward the heavenly hills.

Thither my weak and weary steps are tending—
Savior and Lord! with thy frail child abide!
Guide me toward home, where, all my wanderings ending,
I shall see thee, and "shall be satisfied."—*Selected.*

Digitized by Google

OVERTURES FOR UNION WITH THE BAPTISTS.

We have read with great interest the comments of the Press upon the recent movement in Ohio, towards the union of the Baptists and Disciples of that State. Generally, these comments have indicated a cordial approval of the efforts which have been made in this direction. The *Western Recorder*, of Louisville, Ky, however, treats the effort in quite a different spirit. This we anticipated, from the general hostility of this paper to the Disciples, as well as from its very narrow view of the catholic spirit of Christianity. The *Western Recorder* is an earnest, and we doubt not a very sincere, representative of the most rigid sectarianism of the Baptists. "Old landmarks" are very dear to it, and on no account to be departed from. Hence it stands unmoved by the noble Christian impulses of a large number of Baptists, who love Christ and the union of his people more than their own fond conceits of orthodoxy, and who, in the faith which love inspires, are trying to enlarge Zion, and build again her waste places. Well, since this is so, all the more earnestly let us work to overcome the hindrances which it presents to our union. We must first talk together, and if the spirit of Cain rise not up in violence on either side, we may come to see the way of the Lord more perfectly. Here is a sample of the style and reasoning of one of the opposition, as given in the columns of the *Western Recorder*. The writer, who is bro. A. S. Worrell, of Lexington, Ky., says:

"It seems that whether the common people are ready or not, some of the Baptists in Ohio are resolved on union with the Campbellites Before our brethren take this step, it certainly would be well to weigh the matter thoroughly, and ascertain, if possible, the effect of even such *talks* about union. I have not the slightest idea that anything *more* will be ever realized in our day. The differences between the two are too great, both as regards their *faith* and *ecclesiastical status*, to admit of any (rational) conference between them.

"1 Let us look at the difference of their 'creeds.'

"[a] Baptists believe that, before baptism, the candidate should be born of the Spirit—should be a 'new creature in Christ Jesus;' and that his baptism is (subjectively considered) declarative of this most important fact. The reformers, (if we have any means of knowing what they do believe,) hold that any man who professes to believe that Jesus Christ

Digitized by Google

is the Son of God, is entitled to the ordinance of baptism, and that this ordinance is essential to the remission of sins.

"Here is a *difference*—a chasm as wide as the difference between *conversion* and *impenitence*, between a *saved* and a *lost* soul! It is not alleged that there are no converted Reformers, but we do believe that those of them who are converted, were converted *in spite* of their system of salvation.

"Are Baptists ready to occupy common ground with the Reformers on this primary and most important doctrine?

"[b] Baptists believe in an 'experience of grace;' the Reformers, so far as we know, ignore, or else ridicule this doctrine. Are Baptists willing to abandon this old land mark?

"[c] Baptists believe that man is totally depraved; the Reformers squarely repudiate this doctrine.

"[d] Baptists believe that the truly conqured man will persevere so as to be saved; the Reformers, generally, do not believe this.

"But why multiply differences? These are sufficient to render all idea of union utterly out of the question

"2. Let us look at the ecclesiastical status of the two denominations. The Baptists constitute, as they believe, the visible church of Christ—they believe that their history reaches back to the time of the Apostles. But all Baptists (who know anything about the matter) are aware that the Campbellite church is not *fifty years old;* that it had its origin in gross heresy; that its existence was contrary to the spirit of the Scriptures; and the demands of truth would have been better subserved if that church had never had an existence.

"And here the question may arise, can any organization, arising out of heresy, whose existence, in its incipiency, at least, was anti-scriptural, and whose history reaches backward less than *half a century*, be so reformed as, of right, to be considered the church of Christ? Will those brethren who are so jubilant at the idea of union, consider these questions?

"The ecclesiastical status of the two denominations is just this: the Baptists (in their belief) are the true church, and the Reformers constitute no part of it. For Baptists, therefore, to talk about union with them, is to yield the whole question. Are they willing to admit the Campbellite churches to the same privileges as Baptist churches? Will they admit their ordination and their baptism? These will be practical questions, if the Reformers should announce themselves ready to espouse the Baptist faith. I would caution these brethren to 'look before they leap,' lest they should find themselves, ere they are aware of it, in the condition of the man who drew the elephant.

Digitized by Google

"As Baptists, we desire members; but the only way we can receive members, is *one at a time*. We should be willing to receive members from any source, but all on the same principle—hear them relate their 'experience of grace,' then, if approved, admit them to the rite of baptism. This is the only way in which we can, consistently, admit any one to the Baptist ranks. And those brethren who are so zealous in the cause of union, may, by their 'liberality,' gain many admirers among the Reformers; but unless we are greatly mistaken, they will lose equally as much in the opposite direction.

"Indeed, the Baptist cause could better afford to give the Reformers all those Baptists who see no special difference between the two denominations, than to have even this occasional *talk* about union. It is time for the Baptist denomination to place the seal of condemnation upon all such conferences. If there are members and even churches that like the 'Current Reformation' better than they do the Baptist cause, let them join the former at their earliest convenience; but it is not right that such Baptists still be regarded as exponents of Baptist faith. They are weakening—paralyzing—the Baptist cause; and the longer they are permitted to remain in the Baptist ranks as advocates of such a union, the more harm they will accomplish."

We confess that brother Worrell has a way of putting things, that surprises us. Can it be possible that under his division 1, (a) he can think that he has fairly stated our position with respect to the proper subject of baptism! If so, then he knows so little about us, that he ought to keep silent on this great practical question of union, till he has better informed himself. It is true that we teach, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved;" but did not the Savior say the same? How does brother Worrell proceed with this utterance of the Savior? Does he say that "it places a *difference* between him and the Baptists—a chasm as wide as the distance between *conversion* and *impenitence*, between a *saved* and a *lost* soul?" Or does he look more fully into the meaning and ascertain whether it does not involve essentially all that even he demands. Now to represent us as meaning by the simple requisition of faith and baptism, that there shall be no change of heart, no repentance, no passing from death to life, no "new creature in Christ Jesus," no subjective conversion,—that is simply to speak ignorantly or wickedly; most pitiably and shamefully *ignorantly*, if brother Worrell does not know better, since it is hard to see how a man of common intelligence, and not oblivious

Digitized by Google

in a more than Rip Van Winkle nap, could live in Kentucky and keep himself in such darkness concerning us;—or, so unpardonably *wickedly*, should he know better, that no "declaration of his baptism (subjectively considered)," could satisfy even the most credulous, that he has ever experienced the change of heart which he so justly demands, as a basis of Christian union.

(b) But Baptists believe in an 'experience of grace,' and the Reformers ignore or ridicule the doctrine." It is true, that there has existed quite a difference of opinion or belief on this subject, between Baptists and Reformers, and doubtless ridicule has been used, in some cases, with painful freedom. But can brother Worrell deny that, in the beginning of this agitation about an "experience of grace," the phrase was understood practically to mean, what the great body of the educated ministry and lay membership of the Baptist church now agree with us in regarding as delusion—the effect, not so much of the Holy Spirit, as of the overwrought imagination of persons who were taught to look within their own hearts for a sense-evidence of that which was a purely spiritual and governmental act, and which depended upon the promise of a covenanting God, rather than the testimony of human feelings? Is it not true, that what the Baptists once demanded on this subject, as a condition of admission to baptism, is now omitted, and even positively repudiated by the leading minds among them, as of no warrant either in the Scriptures or in sound philosophy? That some of us have gone to an opposite extreme cannot be denied; but union must not wait upon the movements of extremists in either direction. The "experience of grace" which Reformers have objected to or ridiculed, was the substitution of a superstion, as to the operation of the Spirit in conversion, for the real and essential influence which the Scriptures ascribe to Him in this vital change in the heart of the sinner. Dreams, and visions, and imagined voices,—rising up under the morbid excitement of a sin-convicted soul, and purely psychological effects of the mind reacting upon itself by laws perfectly well understood by our metaphysics,—these were ascribed to the Holy Ghost, and taken for evidence of the pardoning mercy of God in the forgiveness of sins. Stories of this kind, which were told by their subjects, and listened to by examining clergy with respect and encouragement in the early days of this controversy, would not now be allowed, except by the sympathy which we feel

Digitized by Google

for honest and earnest superstion, perhaps, by brother Worrell himself. It was extravagance of this nature that was ridiculed, and, whilst it is always seemingly cruel to laugh at human weakness, especially when manifested in the most earnest concerns of the soul, it is a question of judgment sometimes, with the most conscientious and humane, whether it is not justifiable, as the surest and speediest way of correcting injurious errors in the popular delusions.

I allude to these facts of the past, with no purpose to reproach the Baptists, but to explain what seems to be in the way of brother Worrell, in a manner that may induce him to review his judgment on this point. We believe in and enjoy the "experience of grace," and can see no reality in any man's religion, that does not. Let us be sure of what it is, and how it may be enjoyed in richer measures of blessing, and the Spirit that is the fountain of it in every heart, will the sooner lead us into that fellowship with each other which is among the highest evidences of its possession.

(c) "Baptists believe that man is totally depraved." Is not brother Worrell speaking without commission of authority in this utterance? Do all Baptists believe that man is totally depraved? Surely not. And among those who dogmatically accept the tenet, how many different explanations do they give to it, so modifying its meaning as to change the theological bearing of the doctrine altogether. As a doctrine, the total depravity of man was not held with any marked distinctness by any of the primitive fathers till the time of Augustine. It may be said that it was logically involved in the doctrine of traducianism, held by Tertullian, but it was not consciously held by him even, and cannot be regarded as any recognized part of the creed of the primitive Christians. They held that man is a sinner, that he needs the atoning sacrifice of Christ, and the aid of the Holy Spirit in his salvation, and were content to leave the question of total depravity to the speculations of theologians.

We believe it necessary that men should be impressed with their sinfulness, their need of the Savior, and of the aid of the Holy Spirit in working out their salvation,—and we preach these great scriptural teachings as earnestly and as faithfully as do the Baptists. At the same time we accept the equally clear teachings of the Scriptures as to man's freedom, and consequent responsibility and ability to rise up and act for himself, as he is commanded,

Digitized by Google

doing what he can, as he is required to do it, and believing and expecting that in this responsive effort of his own freedom to meet the call of God, he will also meet and receive the help of God, in the measure of his own earnest and prayerful endeavor. This was the doctrine of the primitive church, and it is *practically* the doctrine of the church to-day. The dogma of total depravity in the sense in which, perhaps, bro. Worrell holds it, is practically held by comparatively few. It is a speculation of the most refined and metaphysical nature, and the absurdity of making it a ground of union between Baptists and Reformers is apparent, when it is known that it is not now in fact a test of union among Baptists themselves. If brother Worrell would apply this test *rigidly*, he would soon find himself separated from many whom he, doubtless, justly reveres among his own brethren.

(d) Here again—there is not absolute unity among the Baptists. Will brother Worrell exclude from his fellowship a pious Baptist who believes that he must work out his salvation with fear and trembling and who takes heed lest he may fall; who believes that after having preached to others, it is possible that he may himself be a castaway? Is unity of opinion on this subject necessary to union of fellowship? Suppose that, it should turn out in the day of final account that the doctrine, once in grace always in grace, is true. Then the subject of divine grace, who did not believe this during the conflicts of his earthly life, will be none the less saved. The error did not interfere with his salvation, and, in so far as it excited him to greater diligence, perhaps promoted his growth in grace. Again, suppose on the other hand that this doctrine should be untrue. Then to thousands, it might prove a source of eternal ruin,—since its practical effect is to give undue assurance to the careless and indifferent, and to destroy one great motive to human action—the motive of reverent and godly fear.

The apostle appeals to this motive. "Let us fear" says Paul, "lest a promise being left of entering into rest, any should seem to come short of it." I am aware, that in answer to this, it is said, that the truly regenerate will not be careless, indifferent, and unduly confident,—but this argument is made to suit the case, not to meet the known facts of experience and the common sense of mankind. With us, the question is a practical one,—and our position rests upon the plain, common sense view that all men take of human weakness and motives, as well as upon the

Digitized by Google

literal declaration of the Scriptures. Still we do not make it a test question of fellowship among ourselves—neither do we understand that the Baptists would exclude from their fellowship a member, otherwise sound, simply because he could not intelligibly subscribe to this inference of a theory as to the illapsible nature of the new creature.

2. The remarks of bro. Worrell in his division No. 2, are written in the purest spirit of sectarianism. We do not propose to reply to them in detail. They are so full of the Pharisaic righteousness which our Savior condemns, that they are beyond the sphere of argument. The sum of the whole is, that brother Worrell would have the Baptists just to fold their arms in ecclesiastical dignity and cry, "We are the people, and wisdom will die with us!" It is easy to say, "The Campbellite church is *not fifty years old*, and that it had its origin in gross heresy," &c., but this is not the question we are discussing. If we are to look to the genesis and antiquity of the people who shall be the recognized church of Christ, there will be some dark places in the line of descent by which the Baptists claim the inheritance. Brother Worrell must not so far forget the facts of history as to overlook the small circumstance, that under the name "Baptist Church," his own organization is not known in the New Testament,—that before he can get back to the times of the apostles he must trace his lineage through many parties not recognized by this comparatively modern name, all of whom were denounced by the established orthodoxy of the times as hereties, and that it is not by any historic claim of descent that any church of any age is to be tried, but by its present living conformity to the requirements of the Scriptures. If the Baptists can lay any just claim to be of the church of Christ, it is not upon the principle of ecclesiastical inheritance, but because they hold the faith and the ordinances of the New Testament as they were delivered by Christ and his apostles. It would be easy to say, that we are not justly accused of heresy—that we do not now and never did hold heretical doctrines—that whatever claims of antiquity the Baptist church may have, we also have, being originally of her, and bringing with us, in our unjust exclusion, the pure doctrine and worship of the apostolic age,—that her exclusion of us for the advocacy of the old and apostolic in Christianity did not make us *new*, neither heretical, any more than the exclusion, by the recognized ortho-

Digitized by Google

doxy, of the people through whom the Baptists claim connection with the apostolic times, made them new or heretical. Evidently the question we have before us is not to be settled in this way.

Suppose Bro. Worrell should be sent as a missionary to some obscure island of the sea, and were there to find a people possessed of the New Testament, and who, having embraced the faith in Christ, were "walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless," would he require these people to establish their historical connection with the Baptist church, before he would recognize them as Christians, or admit them to the privilege of his personal fellowship? Or would he settle the question by the evidences of their union with the Head of the church, such as were afforded by the faith and obedience of the people? So in this present question. I do not hold the Baptists of the present day to account for the deeds done by all or any of the variously designated organizations through which they claim ecclesiastical connection with apostolic times. Surely there are many things connected with these organizations that brother Worrell would not be willing to subscribe to,—which he would not defend. The Baptists have always been Reformers, and consequently have been frequently divided among themselves. The errors of the past, as the errors of the present of any people, are a separable element, which they may throw off, and by which they are not to be judged afterwards. The same principle applies to us, as to the Baptists. We and they must be judged as we *are*, and the question of union must be settled upon the basis of a Scripture, not a historic test. Our present, vital union with Christ, not our ecclesiastic succession to other and antecedent organizations,—this should be the criterion. To illustrate. In the case already supposed—what if brother Worrell should find another island, and another worshiping assembly, and they were to say to him, We are ecclesiastically connected with the times of the apostles through the Waldenses and others, and were originally planted in this island by a missionary sent out by the Baptist church of England,—would that be enough?—would it be a test at all by which he would settle the question of union with them? Would he not rather inquire into their faith and practice, and if he found these defective and unscriptural, would not this single test outweigh all the ecclesiastic title set up through Waldenses, Albigenses, or any other human warrant of authority? The day

Digitized by Google

is past, brother Worrell, when men can be deluded into the belief that they are to "read their title clear, to mansions in the skies," through genealogical rolls of ecclesiastic descent. The true church does not make the true Christians,—but the true Christians make the true church.

We are not hopeful of any immediate consummation of this movement for a union between the Baptists and the Reformers. There are too many men of war yet alive for this. God would not allow David to build His house, because he was a man of blood; and this beautiful work of love can scarcely grow up under the hands of such men as brother Worrell. God must take these out of the way first—and the thousands of hearts who are praying for this blessed consummation of Christian union, must work and wait till the men of war are removed. Their idea of final perseverance is as firmly and even more actively directed against Christian union than it is toward salvation. Ecclesiastic inaction, or repugnance perhaps, will, for a season, withstand the growing feeling of the Christian heart in both organizations—and the best we can do is to cultivate the spirit of union, which will ultimately triumph over that of division. Let all disciples who love the Lord, realize that it is their duty also to love one another,—and that no man, no organization of men calling itself the church, has any right to forbid this mutual recognition of brotherhood in Christ'—and soon the keepers of the rolls of ecclesiastical inheritance will find their "occupation gone." Christianity is not a matter of entail, limited to ecclesiastic descendants of Baptists, or any other named organization of men, in the male nor female line,—but it is the free gift of the great Head of the church to every one that believes in him and lives in his Spirit. Wherever I find such an one he is my brother, through the blood of Christ—and we are kings and priests unto God, whether human criterions of legitimacy agree to it or not. I love every man that loves my Savior, and am ready to join hand and heart with him in every proper effort to break down the sectarian barriers that now hinder our co-operation in the work which the great Master has committed to his people. The Savior prayed for all such;—not for the apostles alone, but "for them also," says He, "who shall believe on me through their word: that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." (Jno. 17: 21.) In this spirit let us work in faith and hope and charity, and God will add the blessing. W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

"NO MAN LIVETH TO HIMSELF."

A HOMILY.

"Alas, the spirit of selfishness in the church! Self is Dives in the mansion clothed in purple and faring sumptuously every day. The cause of Christ is Lazarus lying at the gate, and fed only with crumbs which fall from his table.

"Self has been demonstrated the great Antichrist; not the Antichrist that is to appear in the latter day—it is the antichrist of every day and every age. For it seeks its own, not the things which are Jesus Christ's. It is the great usurper of the rights of Christ; the great antagonist and obstacle to his universal reign."

"As the ornaments which the Israelites transferred into the hands of Aaron became a god, so gold in the hand of Avarice becomes an ultimate good: to speak of its utility, or its application to practical purposes, would be almost felt as a profanation. To save his gold, the miser starves himself; throws up his interest in both worlds; first, starved in this, then damned in that to come."

Selfishness is but self-love gone blind—proved from the fact that the selfish man seeks happiness for himself alone and not for another. Practically he knows not that he is but a link in the great chain of human beings, connected necessarily with the past, the present, and the future. And in vain therefore does he seek to exculpate himself for his neglect of those obligations and responsibilities resting upon him as a rational and social creature, made for society. The selfish man therefore defeats the great purpose and end of life. He would fain make all that he does minister to the comfort and enjoyment of self and of self alone; the glory of God, the welfare of his fellow-man, the social enjoyments of Heaven enter not into all his thoughts, nor form any part of his plans and purposes of life. This inordinate love of life, the Great Teacher warned all to beware of—that it would certainly result in its ultimate loss and endless ruin, if not timely given up and replaced by a true self-love, that seeks its happiness in the glory of God and happiness of men.

As a means of removing this film of selfishness from the visual organ of self-love, and restoring healthy vision, that all things may be seen in the light of a true self-love, we benevolently suggest the following method of couching the eye as a promising

Digitized by Google

means of restoring spiritual vision. To enjoy the nature that God has given us, with all its rich endowments and wonderful capacities, we are to love God supremely and our neighbor as ourself. God's glory and man's happiness are inseparably connected.

But if man become an outcast and finally ruined, his Maker will be glorified thereby, just as though he had continued to glorify his Creator. Man alone is the loser in such an event. God's glory stands in undiminished splendor.

But yet it is a most important truth that man's happiness is inseparably connected with God's glory. Our ancestors were wont to teach this truth to their children in the form of a question: "What is the chief end of man?" The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him forever.

Many, however, suppose that God is only glorified while we are offering to him acts of worship and prayer and praise, and the other ordinances of worship. This is not true, for we are to glorify him with our bodies as well as with our spirits. The members of our bodies are instruments of righteousness, and righteousness is to do right toward our neighbor.

If we glorify God with the former and not with the latter, we may well suspect that it is but lip-service. God refused the worship of his ancient people because, while they presumed to draw near to him with their lips, their hearts were far from him.

No man walks humbly before God who does not do justly and love mercy. The estimate that God has put upon man is seen in the price paid for his redemption.

Our love to Christ is seen in our love to the brethren. By the latter we are known to the world as his disciples. But our love must not be confined to our brethren—to those only in the Ark of safety, while our neighbors outside are perishing in their sins, as well as often lacking daily bread.

Whenever we find a neighbor in need of our assistance, and refuse to give him the aid in our power, we cease to manifest a chief characteristic of Him whom we profess to imitate, and we give way to selfishness, which is the damning sin of the world.

But some may excuse themselves for not doing what they would for their neighbor, on the ground that he will not accept of their aid. But why is this refusal to accept of proffered aid? Is the fault his or mine? Have I, by indulging in a party spirit touching some worldly interest, offended or alienated my neighbor?

Digitized by Google

The gospel infuses a spirit of good will toward men, else the Christian has failed to imbibe its spirit. Paul became all things to all men, to win them to Christ. Nor has love ever yet worked ill to one's neighbor. The righteousness of the law is fulfilled by the Christian that walks by the Spirit. And you ask how, or by what means. By loving your neighbor as yourself. Every Christian is a co-worker with God to carry out the benevolent scheme of the gospel. Hence it is written, "He that turns a sinner from the error of his ways, shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins." And again, "He that turns many to righteousness shall shine as the stars forever and ever." Therefore, in the spirit of the gospel, let every one endeavor to please his neighbor for his good to edification. And that we may do it in a kind and gentle way, let us not forget that we ourselves were formerly foolish and disobedient, serving divers lusts and pleasures.

Living thus we shall crucify self, glorify God, and be profitable to men. A. W. C.

BRO. REEVES ON THE CAUSE IN FAYETTE COUNTY, ALABAMA, NO. 2.

[The following communication revives an old story, which has, most likely, long passed out of the minds of our readers. We had no idea, when Bro. Reeves' original communication was given to our readers, that it would be anything else than joyful news to all good men; but when a corection of its statements followed, claiming that injustice had been done to some of the parties involved, we could not refuse it admittance. It seems now that personal feeling and vengeance have been mingling in these proceedings, and much as it is against our rules to admit controversies of this kind to our pages, we cannot refuse the calm and respectable report of the church, through its representatives, in which the circumstances originally reported by Bro. Reeves took place, and which has a high right to be heard. We hope it will be an end of strife; and that all will be profited by the truth.—W. K. P.]

BRO. W. K. PENDLETON—*Dear Sir:*—In the July number of the Harbinger, current volume, our attention has been called to the publication of a "Report of a Committee" of brethren touching a certain letter published by our brother C. S. Reeves in the Harbinger, in the summer of 1868.

Digitized by Google

We feel it due to the Christian character and standing of Bro. Reeves, and due to ourselves, as brethren professing a common Christianity, to make a short statement of facts notoriously true throughout this region of country.

1. We HEARD Bro. Reeves preach the discourse, a synopsis of which he published as an item of news in the Harbinger.

2. NOT ONE of the committee whose names appear appended to the "Report," were present when the discourse was delivered.

3. We also read carefully Bro. Reeves' letter in the Harbinger, and do without hesitancy say that Bro. Reeves published a *faithful* and correct report of said meeting in *substance*, and we have not the remotest idea that Bro. Reeves *intended* to mislead or misrepresent any body or any thing in said publication; neither do we think that any member of the committee thought so when they made out their "Report."

4. Bro. Reeves' character is *above* reproach in this country, and we do believe that we but reflect the sentiments of nineteen-twentieths of all the Christians of his acquaintance when we say, that we all love him very much for his work's sake.

5. With regard to the main proposition relative to the union of Christians on the Bible alone, to which the Baptists and would-be representatives of the committee object; we affirm that the *very words* they reject are the words used by Bro. Reeves in submitting the proposition for Christian union.

6. Bro. Reeves asked no one to join or embody him, but distinctly avowed repeatedly that he had no church of his own, only claimed to be an humble member of the great family of God on earth.

7. The brethren composing the committee being entirely self-constituted, represented nobody but themselves, acted without the knowledge or consent of any congregation, so far as we have been informed, and were in reality a discontented, disconnected faction, only *one* of them, viz., P. W. Thorton, being a member of our congregation at the time, and he acting without our knowledge and *much against our wishes* in making out said report. We do not think that brethren Hyde and Smith, whose names are attached, were identified with any church as members at the time the report was made; and, we do verily believe, much as we regret to say so, that the brethren Randolphs did what they did in the matter more to gratify a spirit of revenge and retaliation upon

Digitized by Google

the church at Berea, for withdrawing from their brother on account of unchristian conduct, than for any other cause.

8. This is the oldest congregation of Disciples in this region of country, has numbered over 100 members, some of us whose names are annexed have been Christians almost half a century, some have lived *here* more than 40 years, one an elder and preacher for more than a quarter of a century. If our hearts deceive us not, we yet love the Lord and his cause more than all else beside, and it grieves us to see his cause trodden under foot of men on account of divisions in his body.

We therefore believe it to be our Christian duty to defend the character of our brethren when misrepresented, and thought it proper that these facts should be made public. And we would further state that there were but 10 or 12 persons all told in this famous meeting of both Baptists and Christians, who kept their meeting, as we are informed, a profound secret of both Berea and Union churches, for the purpose of allowing parson Adkins, a man of great prejudice and very weak judgment, and Simon Randolph, an excluded member from the Christian church, privilege to render in their one-sided evidence.

By order of the church in conference assembled, December 11th, 1870.

ELD. JOHN MCCALEB,
ANDREW MCCALEB,
NEWTON MCCULLOUGH,
A. C. MCCALEB,
MARGARET MCCALEB,
J. PINCKNEY WHITEHEAD.

BEREA CHURCH, Fayette co., Ala., Dec. 11, '70.

"THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER"—anot er weekly, by Bro. T. F. Campbell, published at Monmouth, Oregon. Brother Campbell graduated many years ago at Bethany, and since, has had experience in almost every legitimate calling of the scholar. We did not expect to see him settle down to the closet work of the quill, but knowing his talents, we shall expect a good paper. It seems to us adventurous to undertake a weekly so far from the centers of patronage; but our cause is gaining so rapidly with the free and vigorous populations of the far west, that we are prepared to think them capable of almost any Christian enterprise they may undertake. May this last labor of Brother Campbell be his best.

W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

THE CAUSE IN MISSISSIPPI.

BRO. PENDLETON:—The Annual Meeting of the brethren in this State was held in the city of Jackson, on the 24th, 25th and 26th of November. Thirteen preachers were present, twelve white and one black, being about half the entire number of preachers we have in the State. I give their names and address: Dr. S. R. Jones, Hon. Geo. L. Potter, Geo. A. Smythe, Esq., and J. W. Harris, Jackson, Miss.; Eld. W. H. Stewart, Utica; W. C. Scholl, Woodville; Eld. W. T. McKay, and Dr. J. H. McKay, Madison Station; J. P. McKinley, Waterford; N. B. Gibbons, Ellistown; Alex. Ellett, Starkville; B. F. Manire, Winona; and Wm. Ramy (colored), Carrollton. Bro. J. C. Oliver, Baldwyn, reported his labors and success since the middle of July last by letter. These and other brethren present represented at least three-fourths of the entire brotherhood of the State.

Eight business sessions were held, in addition to which there was preaching every night and on Lord's day. The utmost harmony prevailed throughout the entire meeting. Not a discordant note was heard. There was no discussion of "plans." "Plans" were not mentioned; and I doubt if "plans" were thought of during the meeting.

The time was spent in hearing reports from Evangelists and others; in learning the condition, wants, and prospects of the churches; and in active efforts to ascertain what could be done to meet these wants for the coming year. Special attention was given to the subject of Sunday Schools, and the religious wants of the Freedmen. The Evangelists were requested to bring these subjects before the churches. To the latter of these, it is my purpose soon to call the attention of the entire brotherhood throughout the United States.

The reports were all very encouraging. They showed that about 450 persons had been added to the churches; that four new congregations had been planted, and several old ones revived and reorganized; that a nucleus had been formed at several points around which it is hoped self-sustaining congregations will soon be collected; that the brethren generally had been much strengthened and encouraged, and in many places a deep interest had been excited in the whole community by our labors, and the la

Digitized by Google

bors of other Evangelists. It was also shown that almost two thousand dollars had been paid during the year for State work, and something over this amount for home work. Full reports from all the preachers in the State, would doubtless have largely increased the number of additions, and to a considerable extent the amount contributed to the support of the Gospel.

About eleven hundred dollars, partly in cash and partly in pledges, were raised by the meeting, mostly from the members of the church in Jackson, for the purpose of canceling the indebtedness for labor already performed, and starting the work again. A contribution of seventy-eight dollars in cash was raised for our colored brother, to enable him to extend his labors among the colored people. He represented a congregation of 140 members, 30 of whom have been added this year, and are included in the number given above.

On reviewing our labors, we feel that we have great cause to thank God, renew our courage, and redouble our efforts.

Three years ago when the writer of this, without the promise of a dollar, entered the field, relying on the providence of his Heavenly Father, and the justice and liberality of his brethren, there was not another preacher in the State devoting his whole time to the work. Now there are *six;* and we trust there will soon be *four* more, as the fields in which they can be sustained are looking out for the laborers. In these three years more than a thousand persons have been added to the churches, and the truth more widely disseminated than at any previous time. Bro. Ellett and myself are again in the general field, relying wholly on the voluntary contributions of the brethren; and we expect to be joined soon by our able, eloquent, and beloved brother Caskey.

In God is our trust. Pray for us, Bro. Pendleton, that the word of the Lord may have free course in this our afflicted country.—Your Bro. in Christ, B. F. MANIRE.

WINONA, Miss., Dec. 21, 1870.

☞ The hearts of many thousands all over the United States, will be cheered by the signs of prosperity given in the above report of the activity of our brethren in Mississippi. The blessing of the Lord be with you, Bro. Manire, and your devoted co-labor-

Digitized by Google

ers. I often remember the pleasant interview we had in your cottage home, at Palo Alto, many years ago, and rejoice to know that your life has been spared, and that your zeal in the good cause is unabated, either by time or adversity. W. K. P.

RESOLUTIONS OF RESPECT.

PITTSBURG, PA., Oct. 30, 1870.

At a meeting of the congregation of the First Christian Church of Pittsburg, held this day, to consider the resignation of its worthy and esteemed Pastor, Bro. W. S. GRAY, the following, as expressive thereto, was adopted:

Whereas, Bro. W. S. GRAY co-operated in the re-organization of the First Christian Church of Pittsburg, and has been intimately associated with it during the ten years of its history and struggles, and has by his self-sacrificing labors been largely instrumental in perepetuating the organization until the present; and whereas, he now feels compelled by pressing business interests in New York City, to sever his relations as pastor of the church, we deem it a fitting occasion to express our judgment of his labors in the church, and our appreciation of him, as a man and a Christian. Therefore,

Resolved, That we regard Brother GRAY'S labors among us as eminently successful, in that despite the almost insurmountable difficulties environing the work, he has, by patient, persistent and well-directed efforts, continued the organization, and now leaves us in peace and prosperity, fully equipped for the work of the church.

Resolved, that we recognize in Bro. Gray the true gentleman, the unselfish friend, the benevolent and public spirited citizen, the cultivated and efficient preacher, the judicious pastor, and the earnest and faithful Christian; and as such we most cordially commend him to all with whom his lot may be cast in the future.

Resolved, that a copy of these resolutions be sent to the *Harbinger*, the *Christian Standard*, and the *A. C. Review*, for publication. By order of the church.

L. L. HARVEY, Sec.

Digitized by Google

LETTER FROM FATHER JOHN UDELL.

HEALDSBURG, Sonoma Co., Cal., Nov. 24th, 1870.

DEAR BROTHER PENDLETON :—Through the kind care and protection of our Divine Father, my spirit still remains pent up in its earthly house; for what purpose he best knows, although it would be my choice to depart and be with Christ, and all our loved ones that have gone before. It would seem to me far better, but I feel perfectly resigned to his will in the matter, knowing that he doeth all things well. As I am verging so near our sweet home in Heaven my faith grows stronger and stronger in Primitive Apostolic Christianity, as published by our Brethren; rooted and grounded in the truth, and the faith first delivered to the Saints, I feel more and more unshaken in it. Although I know that the dissolution of this body is near at hand, it inspires me with such zeal for the cause, that I long to be possessed of literary attainments, so that I could write an article just as I am ready to step off the stage of life, and send it to all who know me, to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance of these things. But alas! It is too late for me to attain to that now. But I am thankful even for the little that I do possess. I can read God's Word, and the HARBINGER, in my own native tongue; and from the Word I find ample means to lead me to a hope of eternal life, and from the HARBINGER I find words of comfort while journeying on to obtain that life. I can also write so that those whom I love can understand my weak and simple ideas; and thus we can have sweet communications together. I would renewedly thank you for the glorious and happy visits I am still permitted to enjoy from the HARBINGER, through your kindness and benevolence, without fee or reward, except what I hope and pray God will give you.

I shall send you a copy of the minutes of our Annual State Meeting, in which you will see the numerical strength of the State, as reported. Probably two-thirds are reported, amounting, as I footed them up, to 2,178, besides 78 added at the meeting.

Thank God I still enjoy my faculties and senses as well as could be expected of a man in the 76th year of his age, for which I am truly thankful. It is more than 57 years since I was immersed into Christ, and I thank my Lord that he has ever strengthened me to maintain that profession firmly, up to the present time

Digitized by Google

through many trials and afflictions, and I have never felt like faltering in the cause, but with zeal to push it forward with the utmost of my feeble capacity. I am still able to walk half a mile to church every Lord's day, and unite with the brethren in exhortation, prayer, and breaking the loaf. And I was also able to ride 130 miles to our State Meeting, as you will see my name on the Missionary Committee. We have revived that glorious work again in California. I am now living like a dove without its mate. My beloved companion went to her rest before me. She died April 19th, 1868, in the triumph of the christian faith, in the 75th year of her age. We had mutually shared in each other's joys and sorrows more than 51 years. I think she was the first person immersed in Ashtabula county, Ohio, for remission.

Love to all. Your Brother in Christ,

JOHN UDELL.

PRAYERS

OF A LITTLE GIRL TWELVE YEARS OLD, WHOSE SPIRIT IS NOW IN HEAVEN, WE ARE ASSURED.

[This was handed to me by a *beloved christian brother*, at Green Castle, Ind. We know not its history, further than is here stated—but presume the dear one was one of his. We commend it to parents and children. —W. K. P].

MORNING.—Blessed Savior, Thou didst say, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not." Therefore I would come, and kneel down before Thee this morning, and pray to Thee to make me a better girl. Though Thou art in Heaven, and I am on earth, yet Thou hearest the prayers of little children, and if they will pray from their hearts Thou wilt answer them.—Lord, teach *me* to pray. May I desire above all other things to become like Christ, my Savior, and to live to Thy honor and glory. O Lord, give me grace to overcome all my tempers, and to keep down all my angry feeligs that rise in my breast. May I remember that Thine eye is always upon me, and may I watch and guard against everything that is displeasing in Thy holy sight. O Lord, take away my sinful heart which is so often tempting me to do what is wrong, and give me a clean new heart; and

Digitized by Google

help me and bless me this day, and all the days of my life for Jesus' sake.

EVENING.—O Heavenly Father, be pleased to look down on a little child who wishes to come and thank Thee for thy care. I thank Thee for all the blessings of this day. I thank Thee for giving me dear parents, and brothers and sisters, and so many kind friends. I thank Thee for giving me a happy home, for food to eat, clothes to wear, and everything I can want. I thank Thee that I was born in this Christian land, instead of a heathen country, and that I have been taught to pray to Thee instead of bowing down to idols made of wood and stone. O Lord, help me to love with all my heart, and soul, and mind, and strength. Make me humble, gentle, and teachable; pardon all my sins, I entreat Thee, and make me Thine own little child, for Jesus' sake.

PROFFESSOR REUBELT.

The following notice relative to Prof. Reubelt, of Bloomington, Indiana, we find published in the *Standard*, and in justice to him transfer it to the HARBINGER. It is possible that an effort may be made by some persons to damage his reputation, as religious prejudice not seldom is disposed to injustice. C. L. L.

"PROF. J. A. REUBELT.

DEAR BRO. ERRETT:—I had the pleasure of immersing Dr. Reubelt Lord's day evening, Oct. 23, 1870. It was an impressive scene, and was witnessed by a large concourse of people. The circumstances surrounding Bro Reubelt were peculiar. It is possible that the fact of his having been excluded from the Methodist Episcopal Church will be used by his enemies to prejudice the public mind against him. Therefore I desire to publish the following:

TESTIMONIAL.

INDIANAPOLIS, Oct. 19, 1870.

The undersigned having, at the request of Prof. J. A. Reubelt, heard the charges preferred against him before the Indiana Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, which met at Bloomington in August, 1870; and the decision of said Conference, finding him guilty of Sabbath-breaking and dishonesty; and having examined the documents in his possession, including the statements of prominent members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who were officially familiar with all the facts in the case; submit the following as our deliberate judgment:

Digitized by Google

1. That the charge of dishonesty was not sustained, there being no evidence of any desire or intention, on the part of the accused, to deceive or to do injustice.

2. That the charge of Sabbath-breaking simply involved the transaction of business in behalf of Albany University, on the Lord's day, which he was unable to transact at any other time.

[SIGNED.]

ISAAC ERRETT,	W. F. BLACK,	W. T. MOORE,
W. B. F. TREAT,	BENJ. FRANKLIN,	J. M. MATHES,
	JAMES J. SMILEY.	

Brother Reubelt proposes to publish soon a pamphlet setting forth the facts and testimonies in his case with reference to the troubles through which he has passed. It will doubtless be well spiced with German originality, and be a readable document. W. B. TREAT.

THE HARBINGER TO BE DISCONTINUED.

As the time is approaching when our friends will begin to renew their subscriptions for the HARBINGER, I deem it proper in advance, to announce that we have concluded to discontinue the visits of this oldest of our periodicals, with the close of the present volume. Other work has so grown upon our hands, that we must either neglect it for the HARBINGER, or discontinue the HARBINGER for it. Between the two, it is thought by nearest friends best that we should prefer the former, and in this judgment we are constrained reluctantly to concur. The HARBINGER is now near the close of the 41st volume. If we are spared we shall bring it to completion. For nearly thirty years of its career we have been connected with its publication—and for seven years, its proprietor. We consent to its termination with feelings of sadness. It seems like the breaking up of a long communion, the parting of friends, with whom we have walked about the courts of Zion in sweet counsel for many years,—the sundering of chords of loving fellowship, that shall be renewed on earth no more forever. It is not from fickleness that we take this step,—this is not my nature; nor is it from the desire of respite from labor,—this, the position which I hold as president of Bethany College, and increasing demands for literary work in other fields, forbid me to expect. It is a question of relative duty—only this, and nothing more.

But it is my purpose now only to make a business announcement—and I will repeat ☞ *The Harbinger will be discontinued with the close of the present volume* ☜ W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

OBITUARIES.

Died, at Bethany, W. Va., Nov. 7th, Sister SARAH GEIMER, in the 74th year of her age. She had been for many years a most worthy member of the church at Bethany, and loved and esteemed by all who knew her. Her life was one of patient, resigned labor: her heart was full of real kindness to all, and her piety toward God was genuine and thorough. Her love of God, and her strong trust in him sustained her through all her life, and did not fail her in the long weeks of severe illness that ended in her death. She went joyfully hence to her Redeemer. C. L. L.

William Smith, of Mullaghmore, county Tyrone, Ireland, departed this life, August 17th, 1870, in the 69th year of his age. He was well known to many of the brethren in England, who, from time to time, have visited the church in this place, and who will revere his memory, but only those who met with him around the Lord's table, and who can testify to his love and zeal and faithfulness, really know his worth. His brief, earnest exhortations and fervent prayers will long be remembered by us. His deep interest in the truth was manifest to the end. Jesus was his only hope, and through him he triumphed in death, and gave full testimony that his faith was unshaken. We have buried our brother in the sure hope of a resurrection unto eternal life, and we trust to meet him when shouts of triumph shall greet our returning Lord. Bro. Smith was a member of the church thirty-nine years, being baptized in the year 1831, and was never absent on the Lord's day, except prevented by sickness.

I. K. TENER.

The above obituary notice from the British Millenial Harbinger for October was kindly forwarded by Mr. Kenly I. Tener, of Philade'phia, who remarks in regard to the subject of it, that he belongs to the family of that name mentioned in the Memoirs of A. Campbell, Vol. II. p. 239, and was associated with Robt. Tener and the little band who organized the first church in Ireland based on the principles of the New Testament. "He was," he adds, "well known to many brethren in England and Scotland, as well as to some in the United States, who have visited the little church in Mullaghmore, and there are a few members of the churches in Pittsburgh, New York and this city who knew him intimately and will cherish his memory with feelings almost akin to veneration. For he was, in truth, a *good* man, and no one who ever listened to *his* reading of the scriptures, feeling exhortations, or followed him in his earnest prayers could feel otherwise."

Blessed indeed is the memory of the just who "have taken the testimonies of the Lord as a heritage forever," and have "inclined their hearts to perform his statutes alway, even unto the end." R. R.

☞ See advertisement of the enlarged "Christian Standard," on the last page of cover.

Digitized by Google

THE CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY, 1871.

W. T. MOORE, Editor.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

W. K. PENDLETON, | ISAAC ERRETT, | ROBERT GRAHAM,
S. E. SHEPARD, | THOS. MUNNELL, | ALEXANDER PROCTOR.

The Christian Quarterly has now been published during two years, without regard to the question of gain or loss. It has established itself among the foremost religious periodicals of this or any other country, with reference both to its literary merits and mechanical execution. Its editors have not used it as a vehicle for their own contributions only, but have rather exerted themselves to have its pages occupied by the best talent in the Christian Church. Among those who have heretofore contributed articles are the following well-known writers, viz:

W. K. Pendleton, B. Hinsdale, Thomas Munnel, J. S. Lamar, S. E. Shepard, J. F. Rowe, John A. Brooks, Robert Graham, Benjamin Franklin, Alexander Procter, R. Milligan, Isaac Errett, B. U. Watkins, James Challen, A. N. Gilbert, J A. Reubelt, David Walk, Henry D. Moore, H. Turner, L. L. Pinkerton, Marie R. Butler, R. Richardson, W. J. Barbee, F. W. Emmons, Jas. W. Wilmarth, B. J. Pinkerton, W. T. Moore.

The editors already have assurances of contributions from many other of the most talented men connected with the Church, for the coming year. The question now is, how shall a circulation worthy of its acknowledged merits be secured? Its publishers and editors have resolved that the QUARTERLY shall be issued during 1871, in the hope of placing it upon a permanent basis for the future. To put it within the reach of all, the price has been reduced to

$3.00 PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE,

making it the cheapest periodical of the kind now published. This very low price, and the eminent position that the QUARTERLY holds before the literary and religious world, make strong appeals to its friends for support. All intelligent persons in the Christian Church, her missionaries and other ministers, are appealed to in the hope that they will exert themselves to extend the circulation of this work, which is published mainly for their benefit.

No discount can be made to agents or clubs. The price will be uniform to all, so that no one need wait for his neighbors to unite with him, but should at once forward $3.00 for the year. If only one number is subscribed for, the price will be four dollars. It will be to the interest of every one to subscribe at once, and for the year.

Need members of the Church of Christ be urged to sustain the QUARTERLY? Those engaged in conducting it do not feel that it would be becoming to put themselves in the position of suppliants. If the QUARTERLY has not earned a claim to liberal support at the hands of Christians, all that can be said will not recommend it more effectively. With this statement, the success of the QUARTERLY is left with those who are most nearly interested in the progress of the Church of Christ.

All money should be sent to R. W. CARROLL & CO., Publishers, Cincinnati, while all literary communications should be addressed to the undersigned.

W. T. MOORE.

Digitized by Google

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER

DEVOTED TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY.

VOL. 41.] BETHANY, W. V., DECEMBER, 1870. [No. XII.

HISTORY OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 613.)

From the marvelous work of the Holy Spirit in the beginning of Christianity, the disciples could not fail to have the most lively practical conviction of his presence and power. It was a practical faith however, not a scientific doctrine. He was regarded as the inspirer of the prophets, and as bearing witness in the hearts of men. The trinity of revelation, as a fact, was implicitly held, and but few sought to reduce this simple faith in an actual and positive revelation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, to a doctrinal or scientific explanation. In the beginning, those who attempted this, even in a partial way, fell into much confusion as to the relation in which the Holy Spirit stands to the Father and the Logos.

The writings of the apostolic Fathers present us with nothing definite as to the nature of the Spirit. Justin Martyr (150) speaks frequently of the *pneuma prophetukon*, the *prophetic Spirit*, but nowhere alludes to his continued influence or presence in the hearts of believers under the Christian dispensation. But Irenæus (177), almost his cotemporary—for the latter was in his prime when the former died—calls the Holy Spirit the *communitas Christi*, "the fellowship of Christ;" *confirmatio fidei nostræ*, "the confirmation of our faith;" *scala ascensionis ad Deum*, "the ladder of ascent to God," &c. He recognizes Him also as the prophetic Spirit, and "distinguishes between the principle which animates and inspires, and that animation and inspiration itself."

Digitized by Google

Some distinguished the Logos from the Wisdom of the Old Testament, making it=*pneuma*; others confounded them, or had no definite views on the subject. Theophilus (170–80), bishop of Antioch, says, "God through his word and wisdom *(sophia)* made all things;" and that *theos*, *logos* and *sophia* compose the trinity. Clearly making wisdom *(sophia)* and spirit *(pneuma)* one. So also Irenæus:—"The word (verbum) and the wisdom (sapientia) are always present to God, the Son and the Spirit.... to whom he speaks when he says, 'Let us make man after our image and likeness.'" And again, God made all things by his word and adorned them by his wisdom (sapientia). In other passages the *pneuma* and the *logos* are identified or confounded,—and the inspiration of the prophets is sometimes referred to the one, sometimes to the other.

Tertullian (200) says, the Spirit is third from the Father and the Son, as the fruit of the stalk is third from the root, and the canal of the river is third from the fountain, and the scintillation (apex) of the ray is third from the sun. But both he and Origen give the Spirit a subordinate position. Origen, indeed, acknowledges the personality of the Spirit, but subordinates him to the Son, by whom, he contends, he was *created*.

It is remarkable that for the two first centuries of the Christian church this subject should have so little engaged the attention of the great minds to which the period gave birth. It is a fine illustration of how little the activity of the Christian life depends upon doctrinal precision in the statement of its principles. Like the system of nature, the system of grace is a revelation which may be enjoyed without a scientific knowledge of its elements. Still, as in the one, so in the other, false science hinders, as true science promotes, the progress and development of the life of each.

From the small space which the subject of the Holy Spirit had held in the speculations of theological writers, up to the death of Origen, we can readily understand why it was so slightly noticed in the Nicene Confession. It is noticed, indeed, but only in a single sentence—thrown in almost as a parenthesis. After the confession of faith in the doctrine concerning the Son, it is added, "and in the Holy Spirit." Immediately the confession returns to anathematize those who assert the creatureship, &c., of the Son; but this is all that is said about the Holy Spirit. This is the more strange, when we remember how closely the consid-

Digitized by Google

eration of *this* subject is allied to the *whole* subject of the Trinity. But the human mind seems scarcely able to entertain more than one great theme at a time, and the Homoousion of the Son was sufficient to absorb its greatest efforts. In the eagerness of the advocates of this doctrine, they did not indeed overlook the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, but they were willing perhaps to forego controversy on the subject, till they had carried the great point of the essential divinity of the Son.

Arius had declared, that "the Spirit stood in the same relation to the Son, that the Son stood in to the Father, and that he was the first of the creatures made by the Son; but then many of the Nicene Fathers, who were willing that homoousion should be applied to the Son, would not have consented to apply it to the Spirit. The point, therefore, was waived,—and if the Nicene Confession did not admit that the Spirit was not homoousios, they certainly conceded, that a distinct recognition of the doctrine of homoousion as to the Spirit, was not essential to orthodoxy. They permitted the question to pass unchallenged, knowing that, and because perhaps, there were many who would not subscribe the doctrine of consubstantiality if applied to the Spirit. Let us note the reflection, which must often arise to the mind of the student of the History of Doctrines, that orthodoxy is itself a thing of development, and changes with the growth and development of the spirit of Christianity in the hearts of believers. So that what is tolerated in one age becomes heresy in another; and even the heresy of one period becomes the orthodoxy of another.

The Nicene bishops had to guard against a two-fold error. They might continue in Arianism on the one hand—they might fall back into Sabellianism on the other. "Lactantius (250), on the one hand, separated the Son from the Father (after the manner of the Arians), and, on the other, confounded the Spirit with the Son (as the Sabellians did)." Some writers followed his example, while others ascribed a distinct personality to the Spirit, but asserted that he was subordinate to both the Father and the Son." Hag i. p. 277.

The unsettled state of doctrinal conviction on the subject of the Holy Spirit down into the latter part of the 4th century is well summed up by Gregory Nazianzen (A. D. 380). In a discourse de Spiritu Sancto, he says: "Some of the wise men among us regard the Holy Spirit as an energy *(energeia)*, others think that he is a crea-

Digitized by Google

ture; some, again, that he is God himself; and, lastly, there are some who do not know what opinion to adopt, from reverence, as they say, for the sacred Scriptures, because *they* do not teach anything definite on this point. Eustathius, of Sebaste, expresses himself in this style: "I neither take upon myself to name the Holy Spirit God, nor dare to call him a creature." Eusebius of Cesarea held that the Spirit was subordinate to the Son, as the Son was to the Father, yet regarded him as the first of all rational beings and of the Divine Trinity. Hilary of Poictiers (368) held it best to remain fast by the simple scripture doctrine concerning the Holy Spirit, which, as it seemed to him, furnished no material for exact logical definitions of this doctrine. He believed that he found in the sacred Scriptures no such exact definitions concerning the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father, as he found concerning the relation to the Son. He supposed that he found the name God nowhere expressly used of the Holy Spirit, and he did not venture therefore expressly so to name him; and yet, a great deal seemed to him to be already implied, when the Holy Spirit is called in Scripture, the Spirit of God, and it is said of him, that he searcheth the deep things of God. He was always aware, as he expresses it in his own original way, that *nulla te, nisa res tua, penetrat; nec profundum majestas tuæ, peregrinæ atque alienæ a te virtutis causa metitur*, i. e. "Nothing could be foreign from God's essence which penetrates into its depths." "Should one ask us," says he, "what is the Holy Spirit, and we knew of nothing further to reply than that he exists by and from Him by whom and from whom are all things, that he is the Spirit of God, but also God's gift to believers, and this answer displeased him,—then might the apostles and prophets also displease him; for they affirm only this of him, that he *exists*." (Neander i. p. 419.) "He also advises us not to be perplexed by the language of Scripture, in which both the Father and the Son are sometimes called Spirit." "He evidently confounds," says Meier, "the terms, Deus Spiritus, Dei Spiritus, and Spiritus Sanctus, and though he believes in the separate existence of the Spirit, he does not go beyond the idea that he is a *donum*, a *munus*, a 'gift' or 'reward.'" Cyril of Jerusalem insists on our keeping to the practical aspects of this subject, as it is presented in the scriptures, and that we do not fall into the false enthusiasm of heretical fanatics. He endeavors to confine himself to scriptural definitions, but is clear in separating the

Digitized by Google

Holy Spirit from all created beings, and in regarding him as an essential part of the trinity.

The growing prominence of Arian errors on the nature of the Holy Spirit did not fail to excite the opposition of Athanasius. This mighty man and vigilant watchman on the citadel of orthodoxy, saw the necessity of a thorough analysis of the whole subject of the trinity, and especially how the loose views which were prevalent with respect to the relation the Holy Spirit sustained to the Father and the Son, were fostering the spirit of Arianism in the ranks even of those who formally denounced it. "'We only completely renounce Arianism,' says he, 'when we perceive in the Trinity nothing that is foreign to the nature of God—but one and the same being, which is in perfect accordance with itself.' He appealed both to the decisions of Holy Writ and to the testimony of our own Christian consciousness. How could that which is not sanctified by anything else, which is itself the source of sanctification to all creatures, possess the *same* nature as those beings which are sanctified by it? We have fellowship with God, and participate in the Divine life by means of the Holy Spirit; but this could not be if the Spirit were created by God. It is not more certain that he communicates to us the principle of divine life, than that he himself is one with the divine being." (Quoted from Hag. I. p. 278.)

Similar views were advanced also by Basil the Great. In his treatise de Spiritu Sancto, addressed to the Bishop of Amphilochius of Iconium, he maintains that "the name God should be given to the Spirit." He appealed to Scripture in general, and especially to the baptismal formula, in which the Spirit is mentioned together with the Father and the Son. He seems to have cared not so much for the name itself, but demanded particularly that the Spirit, so far from being regarded as a creature, should be considered as inseparable from both the Father and the Son. He speaks in eloquent language of the practical importance of the Holy Spirit as the sanctifier of the human heart. In answer to the objection, that the Holy Spirit is called a gift, he remarked that the Son is likewise a *gift of God.*

Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil, like Lactantius, builds an argument on the supposed analogy between the Spirit and the human breath. He says, the *Spirit* (breath) must be connected with the *word;* since it is so even in the case of man. He does

Digitized by Google

not, however, like Lactantius, identify the word and the Spirit. They are to be distinguished. Neither is the Spirit to be considered as anything foreign, which enters from without into the Deity; to think of the Spirit of God as similar to ours would be detracting from the glory of the Divine omnipotence. "On the contrary, we imagine that this essential power which manifests itself as a separate hypostasis, can neither be separated from the Godhead in which it rests, nor from the divine word which it follows. Nor does it cease to exist, but being itself self-existing like the Deity, it is even capable of choosing the good and of carrying out all its resolutions."

Gregory Nazianzen agreed in these views, yet he acknowledged that the doctrine was not expressly taught in the Scriptures—and on this account did not feel justified in going beyond the letter. He held to the theory of a gradual revelation. The Old Testament, he taught, sets forth the Father in a clear, but the Son in a somewhat dim light. The New Testament reveals the Son, but it only intimates the Divinity of the Spirit; but now (through fuller development of the Trinity and in the established state of the church) the Spirit dwells in our midst and manifests himself more distinctly. It was not desirable that the Divinity of the Son should be proclaimed, as long as that of the Father was not fully recognized, nor did it appear advisable to add that of the Spirit, as long as that of the Son was not believed." Gregory thought that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, was one of the many things of which the Savior Spoke, which he withheld because his disciples could not bear them—and he counseled prudence in discoursing of it.

But this moderation could not quiet the Arian Spirit, which, in the several degrees or parties into which it was now divided, still continued to resist the doctrine of the homoousion both as applicable to the Son and the Holy Spirit. Some of these did not scruple to call the Spirit a creature. Macedonius, bishop of Constantinople from 341 to 360, who was a Semi-Arian, became at length the most conspicuous theologian of this heresy. They are represented, by their opponents, as reasoning thus: The Holy Spirit is either begotten or not begotten; if the latter, we have two unoriginated beings, viz., the Father and the Spirit; if begotten, he must be begotten either of the Father or of the Son: if of the Father, it follows that there are two Sons in the Trinity, and

Digitized by Google

hence brothers, (the question then arises, who is the elder of the two, or are they twins?); but if of the Son, then we have a grandson of God," &c. Views like this indicate minds moving in very low and material spheres of thought. They do not rise to the conception of spiritual modes of action or existence, and are besides, palpably lame in their logic. The fallacy of undue assumption lies at the foundation of the reasoning, and vitiates the whole of it. That the "Holy Spirit is either begotten or not begotte ," is to assume that there is no other relation under which a hypostatical distinction can be conceived of, save that of Father and Son. Gregory meets the sophism completely, by the simple remark, that not the idea of *generation*, but that of *procession (ekporeusis)* is to be applied to the Spirit, according to Jno. xv. 26, where it is is said the "Spirit of Truth, which *proceedeth* from the Father." Pearson, answering this same objection by reference to the manner in which Eve was produced, says: "Eve was produced out of Adam, and in the same nature with him, and yet was not born of him, nor was she truly the daughter of Adam; whereas Seth, proceeding from the same person, in the similitude of the same nature, was truly and properly the son of Adam. And this difference was not in the nature produced but in the manner of production."

But neither logic nor persuasion could longer stay the growing antagonism of these two irreconcilable views. Several Councils were held with reference to them and kindred subjects. At length the second Œcumenical Council, called the Council of Constantinople, was called by Theodosius (A. D. 381), mainly to settle this question. The party of Macedonius, called generally *Pneumatomachoi*, from their war against the doctrine of the Spirit, were condemned as heretics, and both the distinct personality and essential divinity of the Holy Spirit expressly affirmed. Macedonius openly confessed that he regarded the Holy Spirit as "only a divine energy diffused throughout the universe, and not a Person distinct from the Father and the Son." "He taught," says Sozomen, "that the Son is God,—in every respect and according to essence *like* the Father; and that the Holy Spirit is not a sharer in these prerogatives, but a minister and servant." Against this subordination and creatureship of the Holy Spirit, the Constantinopolitan Confession declared: "We believe in the Holy Spirit, the Lord, the Life-giving, who proceeds from the Father, who is

Digitized by Google

to be worshiped and glorified with the Father and the Son, and who spake through the prophets."

This decision was made by one hundred and fifty bishops present in the Council, and enforced by all the authority of Theodosius the Great, but the judgment of the heretical party was not convinced, and they continued, in such liberty as was left them, to advocate and preach their doctrine. It seems that eager as was this second General Council to settle the hypostatical distinction of the Holy Spirit, they yet hesitated to affirm the doctrine of homoousion of the third person of the Trinity. They did not use this word, but confined themselves, with commendable reverence and moderation, as nearly as possible to the precise language of scripture. The consequence was that the question took a new turn. The relation of the Spirit to the Trinity in general was admitted, —that was clearly affirmed by the Confession,—but the particular relation which he sustains to the Father and Son separately,—this the Council had not decided. The Confession said—"who proceeds from the Father." No mention was made of the Son. Was the procession from him also, or not? If this question should be answered in the affirmative, then, it was argued, the Spirit was made doubly dependent;—if in the negative, then the Son was subordinated to the Father. Either of these horns would gore orthodoxy. To sustain the Divinity and co-equality of the Son as to the procession of the Spirit would detract from the Divine nature of the Holy Spirit; and to hold up the self-existence and separate hypostasis of the Holy Spirit, would detract from the dignity and essential equality of the Son. So it was argued and feared.

The prevailing sentiment of the age was that the Father was the only effectual principle *(mia archee)* or efficient cause (causa efficiens) of all things, of whom the Son is begotten, and from whom the Holy Spirit proceeds—who performs all things *through* the Son and *in* the Holy Spirit. It had been especially asserted against the Pneumatomachoi, "that the Holy Spirit does not derive his existence from the Son in a dependent manner, but that he stands in a direct relation to the Father, as to the common first cause; that the Holy Spirit proceeds in the same manner from the Father, as the Son is begotten of the Father." (Neander.)

Epiphanius (380-90), who is distinguished, as a writer, not so much for his originality as for his strict adherence to orthodoxy, after having proved the Divinity of the Holy Spirit, says, "There-

Digitized by Google

fore the Spirit is God, from the Father and the Son." He does not use the word *proceed*, but it seems involved in his language; and the same is assumed by Marcellus, when he argues sameness of the Spirit and the Son, in the Sabellian sense, from the ground that the Spirit proceeds from both the Father and the Son.

But Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret rejected the doctrine and contended that the Spirit proceeded only from the Father. Cyril of Alexandria, on the other hand, condemned all who denied that the Holy Spirit was the *proprium* of the Son.

While the Greek Fathers were thus divided—some, like Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, and others, asserting the procession of the Spirit from the Father, without *denying* his procession also from the Son—others affirming that He proceeds from both, and still another class taking strong negative ground against the doctrine of his procession from the Son,—the Latin Fathers, under the powerful mind of Augustine, held with emphasis to the view of the procession from both Father and Son. Augustine argues, that "the Son is of the Father, that he may be God (for he is God of God); he is of him, therefore, that the Holy Spirit also may proceed from him. And he is of the Father himself, that so the Holy Spirit also may proceed from the Son, as he proceeds from the Father." Again, "The Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father to the Son, and then proceed from the Son for the sanctification of the creature, but he proceeds from both together.....Nor can we say that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, since it is not in vain said, that the same Spirit is both the Spirit of the Father and the Spirit of the Son."

This difference of opinion between the Greek and Latin Fathers on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit, whether it was from the Father only, or from both the Father and the Son, was never reconciled. The Synod of Toledo, held in 589, after the West Gothic church of Spain went over from the Arian doctrine to the Nicene, in the time of King Rekkared, decided in favor of the doctrine of procession from the Father and the Son. The creed was authorized with the clause, Spiritus Sanctus, qui procedit a Patre Filioque, and those who would not receive it were anathematized (Neander I. p. 422). While this was conclusive with the Latin church, the Greek church continued to reject the doctrine—and this distinction divides them to the present day. Various attempts have been made to reconcile them—but in vain.

Digitized by Google

The subject was one eminently suited to the subtlety of the scholastic divines, and you will pardon me, if I treat you to a specimen of the reasoning by which one of their most distinguished logicians defended the thesis of procession from both Father and Son. Setting out from the proposition, *Deus est de Deo*, "God is of God," Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury (1098), reasoned thus:

"Since the Holy Spirit is of the Father, it cannot be that he is not of the Son, if the Son is not of the Holy Spirit: for, for no other reason can the Holy Spirit be denied to be of the Son. But, according to the catholic faith, it is plain that the Son cannot be of the Holy Spirit; for God is not of God, unless, either by being *begotten*, as the Son, or by *proceeding*, as the Holy Spirit. But the Son is not begotten of the Holy Spirit, for if he is begotten of it, then is he the Son of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is his Father, but he is neither the one nor the other, neither the Father nor the Son. Therefore he is not *begotten* of the Holy Spirit, nor is it less plain, why he does not *proceed* from him. For he would be the Spirit of the self-same Holy Spirit, which is plainly denied (i. e. by the scriptures), since the Holy Spirit is called and believed to be the Spirit of the Son. Besides, a spirit cannot be the spirit of itself. Wherefore the Son does not proceed from the Holy Spirit. Therefore, by no other mode, is the Son *of* the Holy Spirit. Therefore it follows by an inexpugnable reason, that the Holy Spirit is of the Son, as he is of the Father."

Again: "There is no relation of the Father without a (the same) relation of the Son, as nothing is a relation of the Son without a (the same) relation of the Father. If therefore there is nothing different in the one without it, being in the other, it cannot be that anything is of relation to the Father without relation to the Son. Wherefore, it follows that the Holy Spirit is of both—if it is of one. So if it is of the Father, according to relation, at the same time also it will be of the Son, according to the same sense. But the Father is not more God than the Son—but one only true God—Father and Son. On which account, if the Holy Spirit is of the Father, because he is of God, who is the Father, it cannot be denied that he is also of the Son, since he is of God, who is the Son." So he argues to prove the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son, equally as from the Father.

To those who objected, that this view lowered the dignity of the

Digitized by Google

Holy Spirit, he replied,—"We who say that the Holy Spirit is of, or proceeds from the Son, acknowledge him to be neither less nor inferior to the Son; for although splendor and heat proceed from the sun, nor can they be, unless it is, from which they are, yet we understand no first or second in the three—in the sun and the splendor and the heat, and since it is so in these temporal things, therefore much less, in eternity, which is not included in time, can these three predicted persons be susceptible of separation in their existence." Such was the subtlety of the syllogistic art employed by these trained dialecticians of what we are pleased to call the dark ages.

Reviewing this controversy and inquiry of centuries, it may be wise to conclude with Pope Leo III, and approve the doctrine itself, but disapprove the unscriptural introduction of the clause *filioque* (see Jno. xv. 26) into the creed adopted by the Council of Constantinople—and to those who would still be contentious about it, number the doctrine among those mysteries which pass knowledge, and are of greater importance in a speculative point of view, than in a practical one.

In the final determination of this doctrine of the Trinity, it became necessary to fix and clearly define the terminology employed in expressing it. "Terms," says Whewell, "record discoveries." New distinctions of thought require special terms for their expression. Sometimes these are invented, and thus we have new words introduced; sometimes words already in use are employed, and then special or technical definition is necessary. In developing this doctrine of the Trinity, the terminology, though limited to a few words, was peculiar, and perhaps we cannot present the whole subject in a clearer view or more succinct form, than by a brief recurrence to its terminology.

1. *Ousia* or *phusis* in the Greek; *substantia, essentia, persona*, and sometimes *res*, in the Latin; *essence, substance, nature, being*, in English. The idea intended by all these words is, when they are taken in the sense of *ousia*, absolute, simple, indivisible being or essence. When used in reference to the Deity, it means the constitutional essence of the God, which being indivisible, is the same and one in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. It is the unity of the Trinity. There can be no separation, no division of the *ousia*. The terms "generation" and "procession" do not apply to *it*. Its

Digitized by Google

strict and distinctive definition is *essence—substance—nature*—and these are its best translation. *Nature*, however, is ambiguous, and *person* is still more so, as we shall see,—though they were often used as equivalents.

2. *Hypostasis, to hypokeimenon*, and *prosopon*, in the Greek; *hypostasis, substantia, aspectus* and *persona* in the Latin: *hypostasis* and *person* in English.

The idea of this word was more difficult to distinguish and express. It differs from *ousia* or *essence* in that it is a personal difference, compatible with sameness of essence. It expresses a *subsistence* in an essence, having personal distinctions or characteristics. It is individuality, in Greek *idiotes*. It is not emanation, energy, manifestation—it is solid, real subsistence. It is not attribute, for each subsistence has all divine attributes. It is a species of existence *sui generis*, and cannot be likened to anything we know, save perhaps self-consciousness, but must be conceived by limitation and definition only.

The distinction between this word and *ousia*, was not always made, in the earlier speculations on this subject, and it is not strange when we consider how difficult it is to grasp it. Yet it may and must be done, if we will consistently hold the statements of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity.

The Latin word *substance*, too, we find often used to express essence and personality indifferently—but it were better to distinguish always *substance* from *essence*, as expressing two distinct conceptions.

The English word person, derived from *persona*, partakes somewhat of the indefiniteness of its original. The Latin *persona* was a mask worn by the actor in a play to conceal his real self, and represent the character he was assuming for the time. But when this word *persona* is applied to the hypostatical distinctions in the God-head, it does not mean the transient character or appearance of one and the same being, presenting himself in different characters, but a necessary, unchanging, eternal subsistence in the divine essence, having no beginning or ending.

3. *Gennesis*, Greek; *generatio*, Latin; *generation*, English.

This term expresses the communication of the Divine Essence by the First Person in the Trinity to the Second Person. It is an eternal, immanent activity of the Deity—and must not be con-

Digitized by Google

ceived of as having a beginning in time. It is the *essence, ousia,* of God—becoming by way of generation the Son.

4. *Ekporeusis, ekpempois,* Greek; *processio, missio,* Latin; *procession, mission,* English.

Procession we have sufficiently explained. The eternal, immanent activity which communicates the divine essence to the Son or second person by way of generation, communicates it to the third person or Holy Spirit by way of procession. This too must be conceived as free from the conditions of time. The eternal, immanent activity of God going out in the distinct Hypostasis of the Holy Spirit.

Such is the result of the greatest metaphysical efforts of Christian thought, exercised for centuries, through conflict and persecution, on the deep things of God. We can expect nothing to be added to it. We reverence it as the best product of great Christian hearts feeling after the mystery of God, and struggling to reduce to scientific expression the deep mysteries of faith. It is not vain or worthless, nor yet is it to be too much insisted on in the practical edification of the church. Still as the soul hungers and thirsts after a more profound and intimate knowledge of God, must it plunge more and more into these deep soundings—and well for us if we come back only crying with Paul, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! ....For of him, and through him, and to him are all things; to whom be glory forever. Amen." (Rom. xi. 33, 36.) W. K. P.

THE STOIC PHILOSOPHY AND CHRISTIANITY.

"Then certain philosophers of the Epicureans and of the Stoics, encountered him."—Acts 17: 18.

Since the Athenian embassy at Rome (A. C. 155), the various systems of Grecian philosophy, also, had found access among the cultivated Romans. Some, like Cicero, who was a *lover* of philosophy, rather than a speculative head, selected from the various systems that which they liked best, and formed from it a characterless Eclecticism. The overwhelming majority, however, including poets, such as Lucretius, Horace, Ovid, &c., were best suited

Digitized by Google

with a licentious Epicureanism, that favored sensual gratification and vice, or with a Scepticism, that ridiculed all earnest endeavors after truth. The gravest spirits,—those of the old Roman cast, as Cato, Seneca, Tactius, and Marcus Aurelius, adopted the Stoic philosophy, and the first brought this Grecian plant to full practical developement. This grave and heroic, but proud, severe, and repulsive philosophy, was indeed altogether suited to the genuine Roman character. It only brought its inner being into conscious existence. When, therefere, the boasted republican liberty had perished, and a tyrannical monarchy had taken its place, the patriot sought the more eagerly an indemnity for the loss of his ideal, in a system which inwardly reflected the giant-strength of old Roman independence and manly inflexibility, and proudly opposed to the frightful decay of morals,—to the effeminacy and enervation of the times,—the lofty pride and self-sufficiency of a moral heroism.

The Stoic philosophy rose above the superstition of the vulgar religion, by reducing the gods that were represented as persons, and with human passions, to the fundamental powers of the Universe. But this it did throughout in a pantheistic manner, and without offering anything better in its place. The stoical Jupiter is by no means a benignant father, that knows how to unite the welfare of the whole, with that of the individual, but the iron necessity of Fate, that swallows up all individual life. In this unchangeable circuit, Evil, also, is necessary to the exhibition of the harmony of the Universe, and as a condition of *Good*,—as the shadow to the body. Wisdom consists only according to this system, in submitting with a cold apathy,—and when the hour comes, —in willingly giving up our own life, to absolute Existence,—to the soul of the Universe,—as a drop sinks into, and is lost in the ocean. Immortality was at times boldly denied, and again doubted. Cato, according to Sallust, agrees with Cæsar, when in his speech for Catline, he calls death a rest from all miseries, the dissolution of all evils, and the limit of existence, beyond which there is no more care or joy. Marcus Arelius describes this absorbing of personal life, by the impersonal universal life, by declaring, that "the educated speak reverently to Nature, that gives all, and takes it back again,—'give what thou wilt, and take what thou wilt.'" Seneca regards the notion of immortality as a mere illusion. "Once" says he, "I too flattered myself with the expecta-

Digitized by Google

tion of a future existence, believing what others said. At that time I longed for death; when suddenly I awoke and lost this fair dream," (*quum subito experrectus sum et tam bellum somnium perdidi.*)

We can readily admit that those Romans whose life and being had been transformed by the Stoic philosophy, and against whom the storms of fate broke in vain, present an imposing appearance and rise up like an immovable rock from the disturbed sea of their times. This impression is heightened also, when we find, especially in Seneca's writing, many beautiful sentences, and moral maxims which in *sound* at least often remind us of expressions in the New Testament, though it is evident that they are often the work of calculating ingenuity, and designed for effect. Several ancient church-fathers, believed that this could only be solved by a *pia fraus*, by the groundless assumption, of a correspondence between the Apostle Paul, and the Stoic sage. But we need no such solutions. Without considering, that Christianity does not consist in isolated beautiful doctrine and moral maxims, but in divine facts, in a new life which the best philosophy never could give; and not considering, that Seneca's private character by no means reflected his own precepts:—we need only look somewhat closer, to recognize at once the heathen corruption, behind this apparently Christian mask. The entire Stoic morality, is perverted in its inmost being, and therefore, in spite of its natural grandeur, is as different from the doctrine of the faith of the children of God, as the night, or at least the faint dawn is from the brightness of noon day.

Stoicism rests at once upon a false basis, upon *egotism* and *pride* instead of *humility* and *love to God*. This, in fact, is throughout the rotten place in all the heathen virtues, and, therefore, a certain church-father is not altogether wrong, when he called them "splendid vices." Glory was in the Olympic games, placed as the loftiest goal of the endeavors of the Grecian youth, and as the highest task of his life. For this prize of glory, fought Miltiades, Leonidas, and Themistocles, against the Persians; for the patriotism of antiquity was but an extended self-love. For glory, Herodotus wrote his histories, Pindar sang his odes, Sophocles composed his tragedies, Phidias formed his Jupiter, Alexander undertook his conquests; and Aeschylus, otherwise one of the most elevated and grave poets of all times, holds glory as the last

Digitized by Google

and highest consolation of mortals. The same we find among the Romans. The vain Cicero expressed himself quite freely before a large assembly, that all men, and the noblest most of all, were led by ambition. In another place, he says, that we have a right to boast of, and be praised for, our virtue, and finds in this a proof that it is our own merit and not a gift of the gods. This pride, this self-sufficiency, and self-deification, reaches its acme in the Stoic philosophy. According to Seneca, the philosopher falls behind the father of the gods, in nothing but in point of duration, and in other respects, stands rather above him, inasmuch as his equanimity is the work of volition, and not a property of his nature. It is possible for man through pride to conquer all the baser outbreaks of passion, and the more monstrous sins which lead to a loss of honor; but over the ruin of these sins, pride rises up as the most subtle and dangerous of all, and makes his victim only more Satan-like. This sin, the natural man cannot, and the Stoic will not, conquer;—on the contrary, he finds in it his highest felicity. In *himself* he beholds his highest ideal, and with blasphemous presumptuousness behaves he like the Deity itself. As Stoicism lacks humility, so also it is wanting in love, this *soul*, this all-governing principle of true morality. Who knows not that terrible "Ceterum censeo," of the elder Cato, this much admired expression of a cruel all-crushing patriotism.* Against this Stoic virtue, the boisterous ocean-surge indeed may break itself, but upon it is helplessly dashed to pieces also the unfortunate bark. In short, Stoicism is egotism in its grandest and most imposing, but at the same time also, in its most dangerous form. Viewed in this light, it stands diametrically opposed to Christianity, and the transition from the former to the latter is exceedingly difficult. Tacitus, as it is well known, expressed himself of Christianity with a contempt that cannot altogether be justified, even by his ignorance, calling it an "*exitiabilis superstitio*,"‡ and Marcus

*This Cato always concluded his speeches against Carthage, by the exclamation "Delendi est Carthago"—"Carthage must perish,"—a fine illustration of the spirit of patriotism in one of its purest and ripest embodiments. It is a cruel, vindictive, destructive spirit, regardless of right and wrong, seeing and regarding only its own glory and exaltation, should all else be crushed to attain it. So the history of every age has proved it to be. C. L. L.

‡"A destructive superstition."—Tacitus here expresses himself with

Digitized by Google

Aurelius, was one of the bitterest persecutors of the Church.—Finally, the apathy, the unfeeling resignation of the Stoic philosophy, is opposed to Christianity, and altogether unnatural. It must, by no means, be confounded with the humble, quiet, gentle, resignation to God, that dwells in believing, loving, and hoping Spirit, and rests upon the firm conviction, that a merciful Father in Heaven will make everything work together for the best of his children, and even in the hour of sorrow, is only meditating good

---

the bitterness of a persecuting spirit. How strangely inconsistent with himself was, in this instance, this noble Roman. He who adored with the devotion of his entire soul and life, the idea of Liberty, wherever found,—on the banks of the Tiber, or in the forests of Germany; he who could write, as he has written, against tyranny and oppression, against vice and a decay of manners at Rome,—shaming Roman profligacy and immorality, by holding up the picture of the simple, pure manners of the barbarian Germans in their native forests,—could speak, as he has spoken, against the pure and unpretending doctrines and life of the followers of the crucified Nazarene. From this, as well as other sources, we may learn how the doctrine of the Cross was regarded by even the best of the Romans. The doctrine of Christ they despised as insensate folly, unworthy of a man and a philosopher, and its followers and advocates, they regarded and treated with the bitterest scorn and contempt, as fit only to be crushed beneath the foot as a vile, filthy thing. In view of this, to what a lofty moral sublimity rises up the Christian courage of the apostle Paul, whose lot it was especially to carry the doctrine of the cross among men like these. Fully conscious how the preaching of Christ and the Resurrection was regarded at Rome, he says, "I am ready, as much as in me lies, to preach the Gospel to them that are at Rome also;—for I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek." He knew that their highest systems of philosophy were *utterly powerless*,—could not rescue man from a single vice or frailty,—he knew the awful corruptions in the imperial city, as pictured in the deepest colors in the beginning of his epistle to Rome,—agreeing with, and corroborated by, Tacitus and others, and therefore he could speak with triumphant boldness of the Gospel, which, by its effects, proved to be "the power of God unto Salvation," in contrast with the effect of the current systems of pagan morals and philosophy, whose advocates were themselves, in their own lives, wretched satires upon all their pretensions. Christianity, in its progress, dissipated all their vain philosophies, with all their empty boasts, as the night-shadows are dissipated by the illuminating glories of the rising king of day.

C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

for us. We are not to kill the natural feelings of the heart, joy and sorrow, pleasure and grief, but are only to keep them in proper bounds, and to purify and sanctify them. The Scriptures allow us to "rejoice with them that rejoice, and to weep with them that weep." Paul forbids us to mourn as the heathens do, "that have no hope," but does not forbid all sorrow, for he himself felt "great heaviness and continual sorrow in his heart" in view of his unbelieving Jewish brethren. A Cato, who at the sight of a perishing republic, without a cry of pain, falls onto his sword,—a philosopher, who consigns his wife and children to the grave, without a tear, and in the end voluntarily gives up his own being to the heartless monster of the spirit of the Universe, and is consoled at the annihilation of his individual existence, as a drop falls back into the ocean,—may indeed excite our admiration. But infinitely greater even but humanely considered—is Jesus Christ, who pours out a flood of grief over unbelieving Jerusalem,—who weeps tears of friendship at the tomb of Lazarus, and in sympathy with the load of human guilt, in Gethsemane's garden sweats drops of blood,—and even at the cross cries "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me;" at the same time submitting his will to that of God, and when he has drunk the cup of sufferings to the dregs, with the victorious exclamation "It is finished" resigns his soul to his Father. The former is but a fictitious, forced strength, that comes not from God, and is not pleasing to him;—a self-fabricated equanimity, based on pride, cold as ice, and gloomy as the grave. The latter is warm nature, genuine humanity, moved by the tenderest feelings, affectionately sympathising with the sorrows and joys of his neighbor; yea, pressing the whole human race to his heart and through their devotion and love to him, saving them from the power of sin and death. —*Translated from Schaff's Church History, Vol.* 1., *by C. L. L.*

The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord; and he delighteth in his way. Though he fall, he shall not be utterly cast down; for the Lord upholdeth him with his hand. I have been young, and now am old; yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread. He is ever merciful, and lendeth: and his seed is blessed.—DAVID.

Digitized by Google

From the Sunday Magazine.

INNOVATIONS IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

Few questions have troubled the Christian Church more than those relating to the conduct of her public worship. By what principles is it to be regulated? Who are to take part in leading it? How much of it is determined by the positive authority of Scripture? How much is left to the Christian wisdom and discretion of the Church herself? What innovations are inconsistent with its idea? What changes may be legitimately introduced from time to time? These and such like questions have been a perpetual source of difficulties and struggles, of heart-burnings, and even of separations. One is often disposed to turn from them all with a feeling of weariness, and to think that the time spent in the discussion of them is so much time withdrawn from the higher and more spiritual aspects of the Church's work. But they cannot be avoided. They concern the legitimate or illegitimate expression of the Church's feelings; and, if the expression of her feelings, then also that strength which is increased by a true, and diminished by a false, expression of them. It is true that, as Bacon has said, time itself is the greatest innovator. No Church in the world worships now as the first Christians did. And some of those Churches which profess to be most guided by the positive authority of Scripture alone, have probably departed most widely from the primitive model in which it may be expected that, in part at least, that authority should be sought. The people, too, have often made changes of themselves, gradually, insensibly, without being well aware of either the nature or extent of the changes they were making. Scotland has afforded striking illustrations of this fact during the last few years. It is well known that what is called the question of innovations has of late led, in at least the larger Churches of that country, to much perplexity and agitation, and that the General Assemblies have discountenanced and frowned upon all change, even when they have not exerted their authority to put it down. Yet the changes have gone on, till at least in a very large number—a number amounting to perhaps hardly less than a half—of their congregations, public worship is now conducted in a manner more or less different from what it was twenty years ago. It is not wholly satisfactory that it should be so. The changes, indeed, have been almost

Digitized by Google

always for the better; but it would be desirable, could it be attained, that in this, as in other things, the natural leaders of the people should really lead them, that they should allow for the necessity of change, make less attempt to suppress it by the mere exercise of power, and try to regulate it with intelligence, and upon settled principles.

Here, then, lies the main interest of the passage in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 1–16, which is now before us. The question itself there discussed, the use or disuse of the veil worn by Eastern females in public, is one that has no direct bearing whatever upon ourselves; but it is treated by the Apostle upon principles so singularly deep and important for a matter of the kind, as to afford, alike positively and negatively, a most valuable lesson for the Churches of every age and land.

Before entering upon it, two preliminary remarks have to be made. In the first place, it is the appearance of women *in public* that the Apostle had in view. It would, indeed, greatly simplify some at least of the questions suggested by our passage, could we believe that it is the conduct of women in private to which attention is directed. But it does not seem possible to believe this. The "prophesying" spoken of in the fourth and fifth verses of the chapter cannot well refer to anything but public preaching. Such is the invariable meaning of the word, which is nowhere employed to express mere edifying conversation, or explanation of the truth in the family circle. Thus looked at, then, the circumstances of the case were these. It would seem that some of the women in the church at Corinth had been beginning to take a part in conducting the public worship of the church. They "prayed" and "prophesied" in public; the latter expression referring not to prophecy in the limited sense in which the word is now used, but to all public discourse delivered under the immediate inspiration or impulse of the Holy Spirit. In doing this, the shawl which the women of Greece, as well as of the East, were in the habit of drawing over their heads in public, so as to conceal all of the features except the eyes, must have greatly impeded the freedom both of their utterance and action. It must, indeed, have been a complete hindrance to what they had taken in hand to do, and they therefore laid it aside, and spoke to the congregation with uncovered head and face. How far their doing so proceeded also from exaggerated notions of

Digitized by Google

Christian liberty, from a false application of the principle that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female, it is difficult to say. The usual explanation of commentators is that they were influenced by such a thought. But it hardly finds sufficient support in the argument of the Apostle, to say nothing of the fact that, had this been the reason by which they were guided, it would have affected their conduct as simply members of the congregation, although not preachers in it; and of that there is no trace. The simple circumstance that covering the face with the shawl would render the public utterance of prayer or praise impossible, is enough to account for its disuse. At all events, it was disused; and to that the Apostle speaks.

It may be well to notice in passing, that this is the sole point with which St. Paul concerns himself in the passage under consideration. He does not enter on the question whether it was right or wrong for women to take part in leading the public services of the congregation. He does so at another time; and his views on that point may yet come under our notice. But he does not do it here. He fastens upon the one thing that had probably given offense to some of the Corinthian Christians; and his allusion to praying or prophesying is occasioned only by the circumstance that women, when they took part in these public acts, instead of drawing their shawls closely over head and face, laid them aside.

Our second preliminary remark is, that, in the argument before us, the Apostle has, strictly speaking, only married women in his eye. This is obvious from the whole tone of the argument, which proceeds from the idea of woman's occupying a relation to man that is fully realized only in marriage. Not, indeed, that we are to imagine that the course here pointed out as the proper course for women applied only to the married, and that unmarried women or widows might uncover their heads in a manner forbidden to the others. St. Paul would undoubtedly have condemned this in the latter as well as in the former. He certainly did not look upon marriage as involving anything so peculiar, that what is said of woman in it could not be predicated of all womanhood. Nay, the light in which he looks at the matter is the very contrary. Marriage is rather to him in such a degree the truest fulfillment of woman's destiny as to make him feel that, from the light in which she appears there, we may obtain the best light as to what

Digitized by Google

her nature and natural position are. What can be said of woman in marriage is *characteristic* of her sex, for marriage is her highest sphere—an interesting illustration of the same profound view of marriage that has already met us in the sixth and seventh chapters of this Epistle.

With these preliminary remarks, let us turn to the Apostle's judgment upon the practice here referred to. It is at once and decidedly condemned, and the main value of the passage to us lies in the grounds of condemnation.

1. *It interfered with a certain great order of things embracing the whole universe, and in which man and woman had their appointed place.* Not that, in the essence of the matter and in itself, it did so. Had such been the case, the particular rule laid down would have been obligatory on Western as well as Eastern Christendom, on us as well as on the Greeks. But we shall afterwards see that St. Paul is alive to the fact that he is dealing with a question in the settlement of which it was most of all necessary to consider the particular feelings of those whom he addresses. Enough for us in the meantime that, *according to these feelings*, the disuse of the covering for the head and face expressed woman's leaving her place in the natural order of existence; that, *according to the realities of things*, this leaving her place was wrong. Thus it is that he speaks: "But I would have you know that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is man; and the head of Christ is God" (ver. 3). In other words, there is a natural order of existence: first, God; then, Christ—that is, neither the eternal Logos on the one hand, nor Christ in his human nature only on the other, but Christ the God-man, the Mediator, the Redeemer as He is—of whom God is the head; then, man, of whom Christ is the head; then woman, of whom man is the head: whatever inverts any part of that order is wrong; whatever you think inverts it you are to avoid. It may be difficult, if not impossible, to determine in what exact sense man is here spoken of as the head of woman, Christ as the head of man, God as the head of Christ, just as, in the next following step in the argument, in verses 4, 5, it is impossible to determine what precise meaning belongs to "dishonoring" their respective heads Christ and man, when man prays or prophesies with his head covered, woman with her head uncovered. But it is of little moment to determine it, for the general scope of the passage is obvious. There

Digitized by Google

is an orderly arrangement of existences taken as a whole, and in that arrangement man and woman occupy their appointed place, man subordinate to Christ, woman subordinate to man. It is not merely that men and women are to be thought of in their relation to each other. Important as even that might be, there is something far more important to be considered. There is an orderly arrangement of things, in which the whole universe is embraced. To interfere with any one part of that arrangement is to interfere with all. We may not see the links that bind the different sections of the great chain together. We may not be able to trace with accuracy the wonderful play of influences passing from the one part to the other for the general good. Nor may we be able to tell exactly how a disturbance at any one point shall spread disturbance through the whole well-ordered harmony. Nevertheless, things are so, and it is man's wisdom and duty to keep them as they have been set by God.

It may, of course, be denied by many that this universal order invovled any such relation of woman to man as that now indicated; and it may be urged that nature gives no token that the wife is subordinate to the husband. The answer is, that when woman's subordination to man is referred to, it is only a subordination of order that is spoken of. It is not said that there is inferiority of condition. No word in the passage before us hints that the Apostle would have said that the one sex did not possess powers and faculties, affections, tastes and feelings, all that constitutes the essence and glory of human nature, to an equal degree with the other; while we know, from the whole strain of his writings, that he would at once have repudiated with abhorrence the idea that, in the spiritual aspects of her condition, woman did not stand in as immediate and personal a relation to Christ and God as man. But essential equality of condition between two persons does not destroy the necessity of subordination on the part of the one to the other, for the sake of orderly arrangement, when they are to work together; and, as men and women are to work together in the world, it surely cannot be maintained that the subordination should be that of the former to the latter instead of the latter to the former. The decision may be left to nature; and, wherever her voice is listened to, it is impossible to doubt that the view here taken by St. Paul will be confirmed.

If so, the conclusion of the Apostle is legitimately drawn. It

Digitized by Google

is equivalent to this: to you, Corinthian Christians, the laying aside the covering for her head and face is, on the part of woman, an assertion that she claims to occupy the same position as man in the order of the economy of life. Such an assertion you know to be false; the practice, therefore, that expresses it is wrong.

The Apostle's second argument is that, apart from this great order of nature considered as a whole, *the practice referred to was inconsistent with the proper relation between husband and wife.* "A man indeed ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of the man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man" (ver. 7-9). Remarkable words, carrying us back to the history of creation as given in the first two chapters of Genesis, and bidding us deduce, from what appears written on the original history of the race, rules to guide us even in the smaller details of Christian worship. The sense in which St. Paul's argument in these verses is commonly understood is, that in married life—and, if in married life in general, certainly in Christian married life, which alone fulfills the true idea of marriage—there is a subordination of the wife to the husband, fitly expressed by the veil worn by the former. That this view of the matter is to a certain extent correct, we do not doubt. But it is not wholly so. It neither gives the true meaning of the veil, nor the exact aspect of the relation between husband and wife that is in the Apostle's mind. It fails also to fit into the rest of the argument; and hence, in no small degree, the obscurity that rests upon the whole passage. We shall venture to suggest another explanation, refraining, however, from urging it with over-confidence, because novelty is always to be suspected where others have labored earnestly and long. The principle of our explanation is that the shawl or veil of Eastern women was a symbol, not directly of *subjection* to the husband, but of *protection* against all others for him; a symbol that the wife was under the special guardianship of her husband, his and not another's treasure, and, therefore, to be cared for by him as his own. Much may be said in favor of this idea. In the first place, there is the great testimony of language. The word "haram," the name tor the apartments of women in the East, denotes not a place of confinement, but a sanctuary; and hence the name Haram-es-Scherif, or "Noble Sanctuary," applied to the

Digitized by Google

great mosque on the site of the temple at Jerusalem, the second holy spot in Mohammedan worship. In the second place, it is a mistake to imagine that the seclusion of Eastern women is felt by them to be a degradation. It is felt to be an honor, to be a token of the watchful care exercised over them by man, and of the reverence with which he guards them as his most precious possession. It is not with envy, but with pity, that women in the East look upon the freedom, greater than their own, enjoyed by their sisters in the West. In the third place, this idea corresponds better to what is said in verse 7 of the passage before us, that "the wife is a glory of a husband;" that just as man is that in which a glory of God, so is a wife that in which a glory of her husband, appears. This, however, could not be said of her were simple subjection to her husband the distinguishing mark of her condition; nor is subjection, whether true as a fact or not, what the Apostle has in view. It is not subjection, but origination, to which he refers in connection with this "glory." Woman is taken out of man, is part of man, is bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh; and thus, as in man, proceeding direct from God, a glory of God is seen, a glory which is God's, and which He is concerned to preserve, so in the wife, proceeding from the husband, a glory of the husband is seen, which he, in his turn, must be equally eager to maintain untarnished. Hence, accordingly, the "for" by which the immediately following words are united to verse 7, "*For* the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man;" or rather, "*For* the husband is not of the wife, but the wife of the husband." Lastly, the view now taken is far more compatible with the use of the word "power," in the tenth verse, than the explanation usually adopted. It is impossible to see how the shawl or veil upon the the head should be spoken of as a wife's "power," if it be really the symbol of subordination, *i. e.*, the symbol not of her power, but of her husband's. Let it, however, be the symbol of protection, the symbol that she is under her husband's guardianship as his, and we understand at once how it should be spoken of as "a power." It is a power against all others but him to whom she belongs. We shall see, when we come to consider the meaning of verse 10, that the idea now advocated goes a long way to clear up its darkness.

In what has now been said it may be urged that subordination is after all included, that subordination is indeed a part of the

Digitized by Google

idea of possession. Be it so. We are not concerned to deny that this is to a certain extent true. We maintain only that the prominent characteristic of the marriage relationship here dwelt on is, that the wife is the husband's, his for protection and for care, and that this characteristic is deduced from the history of the creation of the first married pair. It is a striking lesson, the more striking because we have it here as a lesson of Christianity, and of Christianity as taught by St. Paul. For, let us bear in mind that the Gospel of Christ first established the equality of the two sexes in all the higher aspects of life, and thus secured to woman not only a religious, but a social and domestic standing, not previously possessed by her; let us, further, bear in mind that, as we learn from the eleventh and twelfth verses of this chapter—"Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God"—the thought of man's incompleteness without woman is as much present to the mind of the Apostle as the thought of woman's incompleteness without man, and that both are viewed by him as equally dependent upon God; finally, let us notice that, in the inner life of faith, in the personal relation of the redeemed spirit to its Savior, we are taught by this very Apostle that, as "there is neither Jew nor Greek," so, "there is neither male nor female" (Gal. iii. 28), and the words quoted above cannot fail to appear peculiarily worthy of our notice. They will then show us that, in our highest notions of the Christian equality of the two sexes, we are not to forget that dependence of the one on the other which is a part of the providential arrangements of God. They will tell us that as, in the economy of the Godhead, the Son is dependent on the Father even while He can say, "I and my Father are one," so, in the economy of the married state, the wife is dependent on her husband even while she can say, "I and my husband are one." They will remind us that Christian principle does not destroy this order of nature, but confirms and sanctifies it, as it does all other orders grounded in the original constitution of the world, and therefore necessary to the world's welfare. They will teach us that the more thoroughly we live under the power of grace, the more shall we come back to nature in the true meaning of the word, to nature before its harmony was destroyed by sin, and as it existed in the day when the Almighty declared of all things made by Him, that

Digitized by Google

they were very good. And they will impress upon us the great truth that the woman who, in a spirit of faith, desires to fill her appointed sphere, to perform her allotted task, and thus to further her own well-being and the well-being of all, will not rashly grasp at an independence that it was never intended she should exercise, but will see that her chief beauty, her most comely ornament, is to exhibit a womanly dependence on the other sex. Let her be satisfied with this, that as she is not complete without man, so neither is man complete without her; that, while she is one with man in the married life, this oneness does not exclude dependence; and that her true womanhood is not to be sought in vague theories of emancipation, but in recognising the order of nature, in wisely guiding the house which is founded upon man and maintained by the sweat of his brow, in adopting his will as the law of the house, and in modestly forbearing to claim an independent authority. Let her bear witness to the same principles in public, confessing that whatever part she may take in guiding the Church, or whatever function she may discharge in its order of worship, she must at least do all in such a way as not to interfere with her expression of submission to its regular guides and teachers. Let her act thus in a spirit of faith, and she will only enjoy the freedom that consists, not so much in overstepping the bounds of nature and providence, as in adopting them in a cheerful and willing spirit. She will do yet more. She will bear an equal part with man in carrying on the Christian household, the Christian Church, to a far higher perfection than either could otherwise attain. Gaining from man strength and boldness, she will inspire him with gentleness and softness; and the high unity of Christian life in both their spheres will be found in no abandonment by either side of its special functions, but in their leavening and penetrating one another—and this they cannot do unless each, in the first place, retain its own distinctiveness and vigor.

> "For woman is not undevelopt man,
> But diverse.
> And so these twain, upon the skirts of time,
> Sit side by side, full-summ'd in all their powers,
> Dispensing harvest, sowing the To-be,
> Self-reverent each, and reverencing each,
> Distinct in individualities,
> But like each other ev'n as those who love.
> Then comes the statelier Eden back to men;
> Then re'gn the world's great bridals, chaste and calm;
> Then springs the crowning race of human kind."

Digitized by Google

With views like these, the Apostle might well oppose the laying aside by the Corinthian women of their veils or coverings for the head in public. The doing so was a token that the wife had forgotten her true relation to her husband; that she was claiming an independence of him that did not rightly belong to her; that she was even exposing herself to the suspicion of being one who was, or was willing to be, faithless to her marriage vows (comp. Num. v. 18). How was it possible to look at it as otherwise than wrong?

3. *The practice was opposed to the instinctive sense of propriety and decorum.* "Judge in yourselves, is it comely that a woman pray to God uncovered? Doth not even nature itself teach you that if a man hath long hair it is a shame unto him? But if a woman hath long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given her for a covereing" (ver. 13–15). The argument of the Apostle is, that the long hair of woman is a natural veil or covering for the head, and that, inasmuch as to shave her head would be to dewomanize herself, so to lay aside her shawl was in reality to do the same. "Doth not even nature itself," he asks, "teach you this?" It is not possible to understand by "nature" here any law imprinted upon the constitution of man as distinct from that of woman. There is no such law affecting the growth of the hair of the two sexes. The hair of man will grow, if encouraged, as profusely and to as great length as that of woman. But it is not necessary so to understand the word. It is nature, in the sense of those feelings that have become a second nature, to which St. Paul makes his appeal. You have a certain sense, he says, of propriety in this matter; that is nature's voice to you; obey the voice. There are two points of extreme interest in this appeal. In the first place, that the Apostle should appeal to a feeling of propriety at all. That he should do so is indeed a striking illustration of the largeness of the part which it appeared to him should be played in the regulation of the Christian life by Christian instinct and common sense, or by the lessons of Christian experience. He does not imagine that in everything it should be necessary to have recourse to law. Can Chirstian men understand nothing but law, nothing but authoritative command in the settling of a difficult point? Must those whose consciences ought to be so tender, whose feelings ought to be so refined, whose sensitiveness ought to be alive to the very slightest indication of their

Digitized by Google

Savior's will, always be treated as if they were unfeeling, hardened, incapable of being moved by anything except the sternest rebukes and the most fearful threatenings? Surely not. We ought to do this rather than that—our doing it will probably be better, better for ourselves or our neighbors, and more pleasing to the Savior—it is kinder, fairer, more courteous to do it than not to do it, not to do it than to do it—considerations like these ought to be enough for the followers of Christ. This is the principle recognized in the passage before us. You have a certain feeling of propriety in the matter, says the Apostle to the Corinthians; let that be your rule.

The second point connected with his words is still more interesting, for there seems every reason to believe that the practice which he enjoins was required only by Grecian, and neither by Jewish nor by Roman, feeling. It is well known that it is the invariable practice in modern Jewish synagogues for men to cover, not to uncover, their heads in public worship; and the writer of this paper, having once on entering a synagogue taken off his hat, was immediately approached by one of the attendants, and told to put it on. The rule may not indeed have been so strict in ancient times, but the Talmud makes frequent mention of the *talith*, a cloak or shawl of "ample dimensions, so that the head might be enveloped in it, as was usual among the Jews in the act of prayer."* The Romans again worshiped with their heads covered; the Greeks with their heads uncovered; while, "generally speaking, women, both married and unmarried, appeared in public with their faces exposed, both among the Jews and among the Egyptians and Assyrians, as proved by the invariable absence of the veil in the sculptures and paintings of these peoples."† The course here enjoined by the Apostle was then in no small degree associated with the local feelings of those whom he addressed; and, although he grounds it also on principles of much wider application, he certainly appears to have been influenced by what he knew to be the national predilections of those whom he had immediately in his eye. Whether he would have insisted on the same rules being observed at Rome or in Jerusalem, we

* Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," i. 457. Comp. also Lightfoot, "Hor. Heb.," Stanley on the Corinthians, Alford, &c.

† "Smith's Dict." iii. 1612.

Digitized by Google

have no means of knowing. Probably he would; but if so, it is not unnatural to think that it would have been because a course, first suggested by local circumstances, commended itself to him on deeper reflection, as embodying principles that knew no local bounds. Anyway, it is impossible not to notice the importance attached by him to what we know to have been national, not universal, feeling. The sense of decorum prevailing at Corinth, though showing itself differently elsewhere, ought to regulate the forms in which the worship of the church at Corinth should be expressed. Hence, once more, the regulations given in the matter.

It has seemed to many that there is still a fourth reason stated by the Apostle in the sixteenth verse for the rules that he lays down—"But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God," *i. e.*, we have here an appeal to general Christian custom. It is at once to be allowed that a good deal may be said for this interpretation of the verse. Yet, upon the whole, it is unsatisfactory. By such a rendering the word "we" loses all its meaning. St. Paul was not a church; nor, even though he had meant to join with him Sosthenes, or others of his companions, under the "we," could he have spoken of them as having no such custom. We have here, therefore, no appeal to universal Christian usage, but a statement that, if the Corinthian Christians were still determined to be contentious, they must just be let alone. He had pointed out to them their duty, and he could do no more. He had other matters to attend to. He and the churches of God were not accustomed to dispute.*

We have considered the grounds upon which St. Paul rested his decision. The decision itself is given briefly in the tenth verse of the chapter, in words the general meaning of which is obvious, although to give a full and satisfactory explanation of them has as yet baffled the efforts of all the commentators of the Christian Church—"For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head because of the angels." In the light of what has been said, these words ought at least to be so far intelligible. It admits of no doubt that by "power" here we are to understand a shawl or

* In this and several other difficult passages in this section, the author takes not altogether new, but not the more common view. This, however, does not affect the sound, good sense of the article on the main topic—which is the proper relation of the sexes in the Christian church. W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

covering for the head; and, if the view that we have taken of the general argument of the passage be correct, the shawl is called a power, beause it is a symbol of power in the wife, not in the husband; of power in her as regards him, not in him over her. The shawl, in short, is her power *against* others than her husband, the power that preserves her in her proper place and true allegiance.

But if so, what is the meaning of the words, "on account of the angels?" This much, at least, may be regarded as certain, that "angels" is no name for any class of men, such as officials in the Church, or persons who negotiated a marriage. It is a name for angelic beings, and nothing else can be understood by it. Two explanations of their being mentioned here may be given. They were supposed to be present as witnesses of the worship of Christian assemblies, and the Apostle urges, therefore, that the worship should be conducted in a decorous manner, that it might not displease such exalted and holy spectators. It is possible that this may be the meaning; but it can hardly fail to strike most men as far-fetched and unsatisfactory. The other explanation is founded upon Gen. vi. 2, where we are told that "the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all which they chose." It is immediately added, "And the Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man." We are not called upon to make any effort to explain the dark passage now quoted. It is enough that it was the impression of the early Christians that the angels fell by lust. The thought of so great a fall must, therefore, have been a most striking warning against all approaches to immodesty, against everything that interfered with the retirement, the seclusion, of the female sex; and the words before us give it utterance. We would translate them, "for this cause ought the woman (or wife) to have a power on her head on account of the angels," and would understand them as a solemn caution to wives to protect themselves, to make use of that covering which was then regarded as their defense, their power against evil, and to show in everything, even in their outward garb, that they were pure and true.

Let us now look back for a moment upon all the way that we have come. We said at first that the Apostle's argument was of the highest value, not only positively, but negatively, from what it did not say as well as from what it said. An innovation had been introduced into the public worship of the church at Cor-

Digitized by Google

inth, which the Apostle thinks it desirable to put down. How does he do it? By an appeal to the deepest and most fundamental principles that it is possible to adduce, to the order of universal existence, to the natural relationships that were subverted, to the local and national feelings of decorum that were offended by it. There is not one word of objection on the simple ground that it was a change; not one word of the necessity of uniformity; not one word of what would be so powerful an argument in the mouth of our churches now, were a sense of fitness to be appealed to, that one man's sense of fitness differs from another's. We see the question of wearing a shawl in public worship referred to the grandest principles alone, and the great truth recognized that, as Christianity sanctifies and does not destroy the natural instincts of man, so these instincts are entitled to play their part, and to find their expression, in the manner of his worship. How poor and trifling, in comparison with this spirit of reasoning, must many an argument appear which has been used against the so-called innovations, both in England and Scotland, of late years! How poor the attempt to put down, by the strong hand of authority, and with no effort to show that they are wrong, those changes in which the revived Christian feeling of our day tries to find legitimate and edifying expression! How poor the plea of antiquity of practice, which is seldom more than the antiquity of a century and a half; or of uniformity of practice, which has only been the uniformity of some small section of the Church, which even there has not been uniform, and which could only be uniform while different tastes were so careless as not to seek their proper gratification, or so restrained by the heavy pressure of a great system as to be afraid to seek it! We feel, when we come in contact with the reasoning of St. Paul, what a different atmosphere we breathe; and that, guided by him, we are led to principles for settling questions of the kind that recognize with equal wisdom the changing and the stable element in man. We see order combined with freedom, and are taught to value not an outward conformity which, having no existence in nature, must always be false in religion; but such an expression of Christian principles and feelings, as will be the same where these are the same, but will vary where education, habit, taste, national or local predilections demand variety, unless worship is to be imposed from without, instead of flowing from within. WILLIAM MILLIGAN.

Digitized by Google

THE GOSPEL NOT A SCIENCE.

The founder of Bethany College once enunciated the following truths while lecturing before his morning class :

"The Gospel is not a science. Science is to be taught—not preached. But the Gospel is to be preached—not taught—therefore not a science or doctrine. We preach the Gospel, but teach a science or theology. What then are we to understand by a learned discourse on the Gospel ? Answer :—That it is not the Gospel. The facts of the Gospel are plain historic facts. The facts themselves are the life, death, burial and resurrection of Christ. The Gospel, or good news is the meaning of these facts. What mean the miracles and teaching of Christ ? That we may be able to receive Him as the Son of God and the Savior of men.—A good man might do the miracles which he did; but he could not profess to be the Son of God. If he did the former and was not the latter he was an arrant imposter.

"If he was not the person he claimed to be all his works could not prove him a good man. If, therefore, his works and words prove him not to be the identical person he said he was, they can prove nothing else but that he was an imposter. Nor would we say with Tom Paine, and others of the same school, that we receive him as a good man, but reject his claims upon our admiration and worship as the Son of God. The Gospel consists of facts rather than of elementary principles. Those facts are proclaimed as true, and their meaning and bearing upon those who believe them, when perceived and felt, constitute the glad tidings.

"But what are the facts? The first fact, with its import, is one of great moral power. Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures. We then look at Christ as both a Savior and a sacrifice. Not only his own actual death for sin was foretoled, but the Scriptures everywhere teach that without the shedding of blood there was no remission. They also teach that the blood shed under the Law could not take away sins and perfect the conscience.

"Is Jesus of Nazareth then the Christ predicted and promised to the Jewish nation as the Deliverer and Savior of his people ? We have but one way of determining his claims to this character,—his birth, life, and death from the Old Testament, and his resurrec-

Digitized by Google

tion as predicted often by himself, an event for wise reasons, shortly predicted before its actuality, and also for ages predicted for the conviction of the nation. See Peter's sermon on Pentecost on the resurrection of Christ from David. But we return to the first fact: Christ died for our sins. He was then a person of the highest dignity, if by his own death he could save men and harmonize the divine justice with the offer of pardon on the gracious condition of the Gospel—is justice and judgment, with mercy and truth. He must then be the Son of God—His only begotten in whom he peculiarly delights. Upon the dignity of his person rest his high official honors.

"1st. He is our prophet—unbosoms to us the Father's love for his rebellious children of men. He speaks for God his Father to men, as the term imports, and also reveals the future so far as needful to man's happiness."

2nd. He is our High Priest. The fact of his ascension to Heaven, and of his exaltation to the right hand of his Father reaffirms the high dignity of his person. He presents himself in the person of his Father in glorified humanity, as our peer or representative, by whom he is addressed and constituted a High Priest to make reconciliation for the sins of his people. Man, in his fallen and sinful nature needs an intercessor. For, in many things we all offend. The best of men, therefore, feel their need of a mediator that can feel for them in their sufferings and trials. And such a one we have now sitting on the right hand of his Father. One who has had in this respect the experience of his brethren.—For, as the Apostle says, "It behooved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High Priest, in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For, in that he himself has suffered being tempted, he is able to succor them that are tempted."

3d. He is our King. For this he was born—to this end he came into the world. But he was no rival of Cæsar's. My kingdom, said he, is not of this world, else would my subjects fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews. But my kingdom is not from hence. It savors not of the policy or polity of the kingdoms of this world. It is a spiritual kingdom whose weapons are not carnal, but spiritual, and mighty to the pulling down of the strongholds of the Prince of darkness—the God of this world

Digitized by Google

who reigns in the hearts of the children of disobedience. Before his ascension he commissions twelve prime ministers to propose terms of reconciliation to his disaffected and alienated subjects who had taken sides with the common adversary of God and men. Ten days after his coronation they were duly qualified from the court of Heaven, and entered upon the execution of their commission. A. W. C.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

From the earliest days of the Christian Church, the question of the nature and office of the Holy Spirit has always been regarded as of the highest importance, as it involves in such an eminent degree, and immediately, men's acceptance of other important parts of the doctrines of Christ. A correct view of the inspiration of the Old and New Testament,—of the true *divine* origin and authority of the Scripture; of the true *divine* work of the conversion and sanctification of men; finally, a correct interpretation of a good part of the Holy Scriptures, and especially of the New Testament, depend, evidently and logically, on a correct understanding of the nature and office of the Holy Spirit. Experience has most abundantly shown, that essential error on this point has always been followed by fatal results on the whole scope of Christian doctrine and life,—so intimately is the Holy Spirit's presence, nature, and work interwoven with every part of Christian truth. How is it possible to understand rightly the beginning of the Gospel History and the earthly-historical foundation-fact of Christ's life—the incarnation of Jesus by the Holy Spirit;—then the descent of the Spirit from Heaven, his dwelling on earth in the place of Christ, and his great office in the inspiration and endowment of the Apostles, and in the conversion and sanctification of men, and his perpetual presence in the Church, all in his great office as the Paraclete; and finally, the baptizing of the nations into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; how, we say, is it possible to understand rightly these most vital and comprehensive parts of the doctrine and institution of Christ, without, primarily, a correct knowledge of the nature of the Holy Spirit? Suppose, for example, we were to assume that the Holy Spirit, is, after all, but the purified, sanctified state of the human

Digitized by Google

spirit, what would become of all these great divine facts, offices, and solem acts, just enumerated? what meaning would be left to them,—and what would be left of the inspiration of prophets and apostles? But, suppose, further, we were to assume that the Holy Spirit is after all merely an *influence*, and not a distinct, personal, manifestation of the Godhead,—to what kind of an interpretation, again, of these same great parts of Christian doctrine, would such a view lead us? What significance would be left to the *Paraclete*,—the Advocate and Comforter,—and to the baptism *into the name* of the Holy Spirit?—how shorn of all meaning and power would these grand teachings of the New Testament be! The personality of the Holy Spirit, indeed, is a correlate of the divinity of Jesus Christ, as all sound theologians have always understood it, and it is consequently usually treated as a part of Christology.

The Holy Spirit is everywhere present in the New Testament Scriptures, from the beginning of Matthew to the end of Revelation,—and is the ever-present agent in the work of redemption; as already said, then, a man's views of the nature and work of the Spirit must affect his views of the entire whole of Christian doctrine;—it cannot be otherwise. Hence, it comes to pass that a man's views of the Holy Spirit,—if he be logically consequent, which is not always the case,—are a good indication or test of his general religious belief; at least, if he be radically unsound here, it can scarcely be that he is not radically unsound in other essential matters. It is here that we can often detect, most readily and decisively, the presence of rationalism or of a rationalistic tendency, always so destructive of sound doctrine and true piety.—Hear a man, for example, interpreting a passage in which the presence and power of the Divine Spirit from on high are clearly declared, as referring simply to the human spirit, and you may be sure, if this be a habit, that the fatal poison of rationalism,—that is, of unbelief, is working there. Whenever you see men habitually bent on reasoning away the objectively divine and substituting the subjectively human,—which constitutes the great distinctive art, error and sin of rationalism,—then be at once on your guard against the fatal lure and device; reject it at once, and take refuge in a simpler, purer, stronger and happier faith; for if you yield to the mischievous device and accept it, it will undermine your faith, and with it your hope and joy and strength in Christ.

The denial of the personality of the Holy Spirit proceeds from

Digitized by Google

the same mischievous rationalistic disposition of mind in the interpreter,—the desire and determination to blot out the great mysteries of the divine manifestations, and bring everything down to the level and within the scope of human philosophy and comprehension. This fatal passion on the part of man, the out-going of his pride of *knowledge* as opposed to the humility of *faith* that is satisfied to believe where it cannot comprehend (Jno. 20: 29,) has done infinite evil to the interpretation of the Holy Scripture, and has terribly perverted the doctrine of Christ. Yet it is a sin that most easily besets men,—indeed, there is perhaps nothing that men more readily slide into, and when once started more persistently and complacently persevere in. The reason for this is obvious; it is this: the rationalistic interpretation flatters the human mind because it seems to bring the divine facts and revelations down to the level of our comprehension and experience; and then, in the second place, it manages to carry itself with a *consistency* satisfactory to itself, throughout the whole New Testament; this *confirms* it in its false course. It is not to be denied, that when a man once adopts the methods of rationalism, he can manage, with a wonderful satisfaction to himself, to establish a kind of consistency in all the spiritual facts in the New Testament. A man *can* do that, and more, if he goes at it with a strong *will* to have it so,—if he is determined to make his own weak understanding lead him and be his supreme guide and arbiter rather than a child-like faith. It is wonderful to see what we have stated manifested in the history of rationalistic methods. Take illustrations. The temptation of Jesus in the wilderness is thus explained :—There was no real personal Satan at all;—all is merely figurative; the whole story is *subjectively* explicable. Jesus, when he came to the consciousness of hunger, thus soliloquized with himself; 'Now, why not, if I am the Son of God, satisfy my hunger by making bread out of these stones?'—this the evil suggestion coming from within himself. His better nature replied, as the second sober thought,—'But this would not be right, for man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God;'—and so he answered himself. Straying to the pinnacle of the temple to take a view of the city, the same controversy occurred *within* and *from* himself;—and so throughout. Now this is just as such things occurr with *ourselves*, and that is the origin and satisfaction of the interpretation;—and

Digitized by Google

this method is adopted in all such facts in the New Testament. Take another example. Jesus declares that 'Except a man be born of water and (the) Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God.' Now, a sound interpretation sees in this, the work of the Holy Spirit in man's regeneration, as set forth throughout the New Testament; but the rationalist will not allow this. The 'Spirit' here must be *subjectively* interpreted, and made to mean this—that it is man's *own spirit*, that, by being enlightened and influenced by divine truth, &c., leads him to the Kingdom of God,—that is, man is born *of his own spirit*. Now, certainly, a man will say, 'that now is plain; that I can understand;' and this is the temptation and the snare. Then all the like declarations of the activity in us and for us of the Holy Spirit are similarly explained, and a consistent interpretation is established all through the Divine Word, and so the man is confirmed in his false method to the extreme satisfaction of the carnal mind; and there are few ruinous aberrations, from which, when once thus confirmed within us, it is more difficult to recover than just this rationalistic method of interpreting the Word of God. And then, it goes on, and on, and 'eats like a canker,' till it has eaten the life out of the whole New Testament, and the entire doctrine of Christ, and for that which before was full of heavenly, divine life, beauty and power, leaves us nothing but a skeleton.

But it is our purpose, finally, to call attention especially to the *personality of the Holy Spirit*, as one of the truths of the New Testament that have been swept away by the false system of interpretation of which we have been speaking. Before the history of the *Millennial Harbinger* closes, we wish once more to emphasize on this great, vital point of the doctrine of Christ. It is high satisfaction to know, that the *Harbinger* in its last days has given peculiar prominence to the divinity of Christ;—let it also declare in clear language, that cannot be misunderstood, its acceptance, in the highest sense, of the personality of the Holy Spirit.

Our Savior, in his consolatory discourse to his disciples, as recorded in the 14th, 15th and 16th chapters of John, declares to them that when he will leave them, he will pray to the Father, and he, the Father, at the intercession of the Son, will send them the Holy Spirit, the *Paraclete*,—the Advocate and Comforter.—Here three different personalities are distinctly recognized. Christ calls the Spirit "another Comforter" (c. 14: 16), who is to "abide

Digitized by Google

with them forever,"—in place of Jesus himself. In all the passages in these chapters, the Holy Spirit is spoken of as a person, and not merely an influence. This must appear clear even to the English reader; the original, however, affords additional proof. The Greek word for Spirit is in the neuter gender, but Jesus speaking of him as the one the Father would send, indicates him by *the masculine gender*, ὁ παρακλητος (ho parakletos), as are the Father and the Son, thus clearly declaring the dignity of *personality*. The *neuter* of the participial adjective *parakletos*, agreeing with *pneuma*, would doubtless have been used, if the Lord had intended by 'the comforting holy spirit,' merely an impersonal influence;—there would have been no propriety whatever in this change of gender.

Besides, in these passages *personal* action and power are constantly attributed to him: "He *(ekeinos*—'that (third) one'—always in the masculine,) will reprove the world of sin," &c., &c. Again, "*he* shall not speak of *himself*; but whatsoever *he shall hear, he shall speak;*"—to talk thus of an influence is simply absurd. As Christ received of the Father and gave to men, so the Spirit also *receives* and *gives;*—"he shall receive of mine, and show it unto you." It seems to us, this is conclusive as to the personality of the Holy Spirit.

In 2 Cor. 13: 14, we have the same divine trinity of persons in the magnificent words of Paul's blessing to the church of Corinth: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all. Amen.'

In the formula of baptism, as given in the words of Christ, Matt. 28: 19,—'baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,' the Spirit is in rank with the Father and the Son; if it were an *influence* merely of the Father and the Son, this could not be, for then it would be comprehended in these. The whole style of these great words shows the *rank* the Spirit here occupies with the Father and the Son, as a *person* with these *two persons*. Finally, to baptize the nations *into the name* (give this expression whatever meaning you please) of an influence, especially after '*into the name* of the Father and of the Son,' is really too absurd to merit a moment's attention.

The Holy Spirit, again, is our intercessor with the Father,—Rom. 8: 26, 27: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the

Digitized by Google

Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which can not be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts (i. e. God) knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to (the will of) God." The distinct personal agency of the Spirit here for us with God, is very clearly stated.

We shall go no further in citing texts and proofs,—these are abundant. Let any one with care collate the passages in the New Testament (and even in the Old) where the Holy Spirit's office and work are mentioned, and they cannot but convince him, if he accept the teachings of the Word of God in the simplicity and docility of faith, and in the ardent love of the truth, that the Holy Spirit is one of the distinct, personal manifestations of the Godhead, together with the Father and the Son.

We rejoice that A. Campbell, in the richest maturity of his intellect and in his ripest Christian knowledge, so fully and so clearly and grandly declared this great truth in his discussion on the Holy Spirit, at Lexington, in 1843. "Since the descent of the Holy Spirit, on the birth-day of Christ's church—since the glorious immersion of the three thousand triumphs of the memorable Pentecost, the church has enjoyed the mysteries and sublime light of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, as one Divinity, manifesting itself in these incomprehensible relations, in order to effect the complete recovery and perfect redemption of men from the guilt, the pollution, the power and the punishment of sin.—No one, Mr. President, believes more firmly than I, and no one, I presume, endeavors to teach more distinctly and comprehensively than I, this mysterious, sublime, and incomprehensible plurality and unity in the Godhead." Such were the strong words of the great man, and we rejoice to record this clear declaration of so important a truth here.

For ourselves, in all charity, we must insist on the acceptance of the divinity of Jesus Christ, and of the reality of the *personal* agency of the Holy Spirit in the work of redemption, as *essential* to soundness in Christian doctrine. There must be no complaisant compromising here;—we must resist to the utmost every attempt of rationalism to enter in among us; and we must labor, if this leaven of evil is anywhere in any guise among us, to cast it out.

May God lead us into all truth, and save us from all error!

Digitized by Google

Our labors in the *Harbinger* are now closed. If our humble contributions to its pages, for the years we have been connected with it, have been of any real profit to any, we thank God for it. It is not without regret that we write these as the last lines for the *Harbinger*, and as the last adieu to its readers. C. L. L.

AN ADDRESS TO THE CHURCH, AND A TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF MY HUSBAND.

BY MRS. S. H. CAMPBELL.

(Read to the church in Bethany by C. L. Loos, and published by request.)

BETHANY, W. V., Nov. 5, 1867.

To the faithful brethren and sisters in the church of Bethany, Greeting:

Expecting to be absent from your midst, and thus from your fellowship and communion, for sometime, I sincerely and earnestly solicit your supplications and prayers on my behalf,—that I may continue to enjoy the fullness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ Jesus my Lord; and that in due time, under a gracious Providence, I may be restored to your society, and Christian fellowship and communion.

Now forty years, within a few moons, have I worshiped in this place, and it fills my heart and soul with inexpressible emotion to think of leaving for a season, this to me hallowed, consecrated spot! When first I was introduced into the society of Bethany, there was not, had not been, a house erected for the purpose of worshiping God in. But we assembled in plain rooms, and often, very often, under the spreading, lofty trees on the banks bordering the winding stream that surrounds the humble village of Bethany and its environs.

After sometime, a house was erected of stone, on the ground where the worshiping assembly now meet. It proving too small to accommodate the members and the hearers who assembled, it was taken down, and the one built that is now occupied.

It is to me (now past my three-score years) a sad but impressive esson, to know, that *not one voice* that ascended in aspirations of prayer and praise to the Father of tender mercies, in the assembling of the saints here at that day, is now heard within these walls! And but one or two now survive (and they are too much

Digitized by Google

bodily afflicted to come to the church) who were worshipers with the members forty years ago. Harmony and love and active zeal then prevailed amongst them. They were wont to exhort and watch over one another, with that earnest solicitude that can only be felt and exercised under the trials, derisions and persecutions that were at that time the lot of those who were endeavoring to establish and to walk in the simple, but at the same time the sublime and sanctifying, *ordinances* of the gospel of Christ. Many elderly saints, and young lambs of the fold, have passed away, and have been gathered into the garner of God, and are now felicitating themselves in feeding upon the heavenly manna, and in drinking from the pure crystal streams issuing from the throne of God and of the Lamb.

That noble voice, so lately hushed in death, and whose venerated dust lies entombed upon yonder sacred mount beside his venerated father, who lived to enter upon his five-score winters—both of them have traversed this country far and wide, proclaiming and advocating the blessed message sent by God to man, in the person and teaching of the glorious Redeemer, the Prince of life and peace!—yes, on the banks of this stream, more than fifty years ago, did my beloved husband, Alexander Campbell, enchain multitudes, while pleading for the things pertaining to the establishment of Christ's kingdom according to the Holy Oracles, and striving to turn sinners from darkness to enjoy the marvelous light and love brought to a lost and ruined, wretched world, through the sacrifice of God's beloved Son! Yes, and long did he teach and preach for, and nurse the church of Bethany, even as a kind father does his children. Often on this spot, in by-gone years, have we assembled in good time on the Lord's day mornings and remained until the afternoon, bringing refreshments—and having an interval of three quarters or an hour, when a lofty hymn of praise by some brother within would be the signal for re-assembling for the afternoon worship.

But Mr. Campbell's great philanthropy did not keep him only amongst his own loved hills. His love for humanity led him to travel and toil abroad, which he did in nearly all of these United States and also in Europe, to enable him (it was a favorite saying of his) "to sow broadcast the seeds of the divinely inspired word of the living God, as it was given by Heaven's own inspiration, untrammeled by the teachings and doctrines of men." And sure-

Digitized by Google

ly a great and good work in his day did he accomplish, under the care-taking of the almighty, omnipotent Jehovah. What is still so beautiful to remember and to contemplate—although a frail mortal like his brethren, he was enabled by divine grace "to practice what he preached." *His whole life* daily both at home and abroad was an exemplification of LOVE—love to God his Father, and love "and good will to man." Never did I at any time in all my life, hear him utter a resentful word against mortal. He was emphatically a man of fervent, ardent prayer—constantly, in the family (and oh what prayers were his!) and in the closet. Of late years, as he approached nearer the spirit-land, have I often heard him in the solemn midnight hour, most devotedly and connectedly pray, whilst profoundly asleep—so that it made the place feel near to the gate of Heaven! Also a short time previous to his leaving the shores of mortality, did he deliver, whilst wrapt in sleep, a thrilling discourse upon the second coming of our Savior!

But the now sainted hero of the Cross has finished his earthly toils and journeyings of nearly four-score years, in the quiet vale of Bethany, under his own roof-tree, amidst the loving, agonizing hearts that surrounded his dying bed, with a full consciousness of the smiles and approabation of his Divine Father and his God; with the effulgent rays of the Redeemer of sinners—the Sun of Righteousness—beaming benignantly upon his spiritual vision; with all the comforting, elevating, soul-cheering, beatifying influences and inspirations of the Holy Spirit hovering over him, and around him, and dwelling in his heart. When at last he was loosed from his clay tenements, his angels escorted him to the skies, introducing him "as the new arrived" into the society of the redeemed of all ages and generations.

> "The saints of that city he'll walk with forever,
> Whose walls are of jasper and streets are of gold;
> The sun will not scorch him—and Jesus the Savior
> Shall reign, and forever his glories unfold."

Yes, he is crowned with light and glory immortal, and now is "rising higher and higher" in the knowledge of God, and the dicoveries of the beauties, and the glories, and the riches of the heavenly and eternal city of the great Jehovah, the Lord God, the Almighty!

These considerations are my consolation in the present painful separation from one so pure, and so affectionate and devoted in all

Digitized by Google

the relations of life. Then add the hope of the resurrection from the dead, and the spiritual re-union in the land where no parting comes, and no sorrow prevails. These thoughts still highten the solace, and bid me wait with patience and resignation that expected hour, when we shall be transformed into the likeness of our Divine Redeemer.

"We know we all, when he appears,
Shall bear his image bright;
And all his glory full disclosed
Shall open to our sight."

But here again, before I close, permit me to recur to a few striking traits in the character of the sainted dead. His devotion to the cause of literature and science is well known. But the depth of feeling he entertained for the young and rising generation, and the youth committed to his care, who left their endeared and sacred homes to become inmates of the Institution of which he was the founder, can never be fully appreciated. His constant, unwearied prayers and Lectures with them and for them for years in the College (and only a tithe of their value has been given), is evidence of his endurance and self-sacrificing spirit. His manly, sympathetic heart more than vibrated with pleasure, yea with an ecstasy, in looking over an assembled multitude of youth before him (his brilliant eye would increase with brilliancy), with the desire of making impressions thereupon that would ennoble them, elevate them, and teach them their high origin and destiny as men made in the image of God. To teach them the value of time, and of self-government, and of "treasuring up knowledge whilst in the spring-time of life," was his most earnest endeavor. But the religious culture was one of his greatest themes,—one of superlative importance. And thus to induct the young mind into the knowledge of God,—of the wonders of creation and redemption,—were his loftiest themes. I have said that I thought *no one* under such training could ever leave Bethany College with skeptical views, even though he was not converted to the Christian religion. But I lay down my pen, as I find the theme exhaustless.—I would here say, however, that I would fain hope that *now*, and in *after years*, the youth who shall assemble here to attend in these college halls, may ever be inspired with such reverence for the illustrious dead, that they may be induced to repair to the

Digitized by Google

place where he sleeps in sweet repose, and there "linger awhile" and contemplate the character of him who was thus prompted with the loftiest and most philanthropic feelings that could dwell in the heart of mortal, for the improvement and elevation of his race. And let them endeavor to carry away with them from that hallowed spot, an odor, an unction, and a portion of that spirit that characterized him. And let them endeavor to imitate him in his humility, his untiring energy of character, and in his devotion to the good of humanity and the glory of God. And in so doing, they will be happy both in life and in death. And oh, my heart's earnest desire is, that the prayers and the labors, and indeed the whole design of the founder of that Bible-teaching Institution, may be prosperously continued, and its duties fully carried out, for time indefinite, that the youthful mind and heart may be nourished, and cherished, and fostered, and cultured, with all that auspicious watchfulness and care that will enable them, wherever their lot may be cast, to shine as luminaries for the good of society, and for their own happiness. For "our being's aim and end is happiness." And thus the benevolent projector of the Bible-teaching College at Bethany, "though dead, will still speak."

I would now say farewell to the church and to the college.—Affectionately yours, MRS. SELINA H. CAMPBELL.

THE LONELINESS OF CHRIST.

A SERMON BY F. W. ROBERTSON.

JOHN xvi. 31, 32—"Jesus answered them, Do ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh, yea is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone: and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me."

There are two kinds of solitude: the first consisting of insulation in space; the other, of isolation of the spirit. The first is simply separation by distance. When we are seen, touched, heard by none, we are said to be alone. And all hearts respond to the truth of that saying, This is not solitude; for sympathy can people our solitude with a crowd. The fisherman on the ocean alone at night is not alone, when he remembers the earnest longings which are arising up to heaven at home for his safety. The traveler is not alone, when the faces which will greet him on his

Digitized by Google

arrival seem to beam upon him as he trudges on. The solitary student is not alone, when he feels that human hearts will respond to the truths which he is preparing to address to them.

The other is loneliness of soul. There are times when hands touch ours, but only send an icy chill of unsympathizing indifference to the heart; when eyes gaze into ours, but with a glazed look which cannot read into the bottom of our souls; when words pass from our lips, but only come back as an echo reverberated without reply through a dreary solitude; when the multitude throng and press us, and we cannot say, as Christ said, "Somebody hath *touched* me:" for the contact has not been between soul and soul, but only between form and form.

And there are two kinds of men, who feel this last solitude in different ways. The first are the men of self-reliance,—self-dependent: who ask no counsel, and crave no sympathy; who act and resolve alone,—who can go sternly through duty, and scarcely shrink, let what will be crushed in them. Such men command respect: for whoever respects himself constrains the respect of others. They are invaluable in all those professions of life in which sensitive feeling would be a superfluity: they make iron commanders, surgeons who do not shrink, and statesmen who do not flinch from their purpose for the dread of unpopularity. But mere self-dependence is weakness; and the conflict is terrible when a human sense of weakness is felt by such men. Jacob was alone when he slept in his way to Padan Aram, the first night that he was away from his father's roof, with the world before him, and all the old broken up; and Elijah was alone in the wilderness when the court had deserted him, and he said, "They have digged down thine altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I, only am left, and they seek my life to take it away." But the loneliness of the tender Jacob was very different from that of the stern Elijah. To Jacob the sympathy he yearned for was realized in the form of a gentle dream. The ladder raised from earth to heaven figured the possibility of communion between the spirit of man, and the Spirit of God. In Elijah's case, the storm, and the earthquake, and the fire, did their convulsive work in the soul, before a still, small voice told him that he was not alone. In such a spirit the sense of weakness comes with a burst of agony, and the dreadful conviction of being alone manifests itself with a rending of the heart of rock. It is only so that

Digitized by Google

such souls can be taught that the Father is with them, and that they are not alone.

There is another class of men, who live in sympathy. These are affectionate minds, which tremble at the thought of being alone: not from want of courage nor from weakness of intellect comes their dependence upon others, but from the intensity of their affections. It is the trembling spirit of humanity in them. They want not aid, nor even countenance, but only sympathy. And the trial comes to them not in the shape of fierce struggle, but of chill and utter loneliness, when they are called upon to perform a duty on which the world looks coldly, or to embrace a truth which has not found lodgment yet in the breast of others.

It is to this latter and not to the former class that we must look, if we would understand the spirit in which the words of the text were pronounced. The deep Humanity of the Soul of Christ was gifted with those finer sensibilities of affectionate nature which stand in need of sympathy. He not only gave sympathy, but wanted it, too, from others. He who selected the gentle John to be his friend,—who found solace in female sympathy, attended by the women who ministered to Him out of their substance,—who in the Trial hour could not bear even to pray without the human presence, which is the pledge and reminder of God's presence, had nothing in Him of the hard, merely self-dependent character. Even this verse testifies to the same fact. A stern spirit never could have said, "I am not alone: the Father is with me;" never would have felt the loneliness which needed the balancing truth. These words tell of a struggle, an inward reasoning, a difficulty and a reply, a sense of solitude,—"I shall be alone;" and an immediate correction of that: "Not alone: the Father is with Me."

There is no thought connected with the Life of Christ more touching, none that seems so peculiarly to characterize His Spirit, as the solitariness in which he lived. Those who understood Him best only understood him half. Those who knew Him best scarcely could be said to know him. On this occasion the disciples thought, Now we do understand, now we do believe. The lonely Spirit answered, "*Do* ye now believe? Behold the hour cometh that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone."

Very impressive is that trait in his History. He was in this world alone.

Digitized by Google

I. First, then, we meditate on the loneliness of Christ.

II. On the temper of His solitude.

1. The loneliness of Christ was caused by the Divine elevation of His character. His infinite superiority severed Him from sympathy; His exquisite affectionateness made that want of sympathy a keen trial.

There is a second-rate greatness which the world can comprehend. If we take two who are brought into direct contrast by Christ Himself, the one the type of human, the other that of Divine excellence, the Son of Man and John the Baptist, this becomes clearly manifest. John's life had a certain rude, rugged goodness, on which was written, in characters which required no magnifying glass to read, spiritual excellence. The world, on the whole, accepted him. The Pharisees and Sadducees went to his baptism, The people idolized him as a prophet; and, if he had not chanced to cross the path of a weak prince and a revengeful woman, we can see no reason why John might not have finished his course with joy, recognized as irreproachable. If we inquire why it was that the world accepted John and rejected Cnrist, one reply appears to be, that the life of the one was finitely simple and one-sided, that of the Other divinely complex. In physical nature, the naturalist finds no difficulty in comprehending the simple structure of the lowest organizations of animal life, where one uniform texture, and one organ performing the office of brain and heart and lungs at once, leave little to perplex. But when he comes to study the complex anatomy of man, he has the labor of a lifetime before him. It is not difficult to master the constitution of a single country; but when you try to understand the universe, you find the infinite appearances of contradiction: law opposed by law; motion balanced by motion; happiness blended with misery; and the power to elicit a divine order and unity out of this complex variety is given to only a few of the gifted of the race. That which the structure of man is to the structure of the limpet, that which the universe is to a single country, the complex and boundless soul of Christ was to the souls of other men. Therefore, to the superficial observer, His life was a mass of inconsistencies and contradictions. All thought themselves qualified to point out the discrepancies. The Pharisees could not comprehend how a holy teacher could eat with publicans and sinners. His own brethren could not reconcile His assumption of a public

Digitized by Google

office with the privacy which He aimed at keeping. "If thou doest these things," show thyself to the world." Some thought he was "a good man;" others said, "Nay, but he deceiveth the people." And hence it was that He lived to see all the acceptance which had marked the earlier stage of his career—as, for instance, at Capernaum—melt away. First, the Pharisees took the alarm; then the Sadducees; then the political party of the Herodians; then the people. That was the most terrible of all: for the enmity of the upper classes is impotent; but when that cry of brute force is stirred from the deeps of society, as deaf to the voice of reason as the ocean in its strength churned into raving foam by the winds, the heart of mere earthly oak quails before that. The apostles, at all events, did quail. One denied; another betrayed; all deserted. They "were scattered, each to his own:" and the Truth Himself was left alone in Pilate's judgment-hall.

Now learn from this a very important distinction. To feel solitary is no uncommon thing. To complain of being alone, without sympathy, and misunderstood, is general enough. In every place, in many a family, these victims of diseased sensibility are to be found, and they might find a weakening satisfaction in observing a a parallel between their own feelings and those of Jesus. But before that parallel is assumed, be very sure that it is, as in His case, the elevation of your character which severs you from your species. The world has small sympathy for Divine goodness; but it also has little for a great many other qualities which are disagreeable to it. You meet with no response; you are passed by; find yourself unpopular; meet with little communion. Well! Is that because you are above the world,—nobler, devising and executing grand plans, which they cannot comprehend; vindicating the wronged; proclaiming and living on great principles; offending it by the saintliness of your purity, and the unworldliness of your aspirations? Then yours is the loneliness of Christ. Or is it that you are wrapped up in self,—cold, disobliging, sentimental, indifferent about the welfare of others, and very much astonished that they are not deeply interested in you? *You* must not use these words of Christ. They have nothing to do with you.

Let us look at one or two of the occasions on which this loneliness was felt.

The first time was when He was but twelve years old, when His parents found Him in the temple, hearing the Doctors and asking

Digitized by Google

them questions. High thoughts were in the Child's soul; expanding views of life; larger views of duty, and his own destiny.

There is a moment in every true life—to some it comes very early—when the old routine of duty is not large enough; when the parental roof seems too low, because the Infinite above is arching over the soul; when the old formulas, in creeds, catechisms, and articles, seem to be narrow, and they must either be thrown aside, or else transformed into living and breathing realities; when the earthly father's authority is being superseded by the claims of a Father in heaven.

That is a lonely, lonely moment, when the young soul first feels God—when this earth is recognized as an "awful place, yea, the very gate of heaven;" when the dream-ladder is seen planted against the skies, and we wake, and the dream haunts us as a sublime reality.

You may detect the approach of that moment in the young man or young woman by the awakened spirit of inquiry; by a certain restlessness of look, and an eager earnestness of tone; by the devouring study of all kinds of books; by the waning of your own influence, while the inquirer is asking the truth of the Doctors and Teachers in the vast Temple of the world; by a certain opinionativeness, which is austere and disagreeable enough; but the austerest moment of the fruit's taste is that in which it is passing from greenness into ripeness. If you wait with patience, the sour will become sweet. Rightly looked at, that opinionativeness is more truly anguish; the fearful solitude of feeling the insecurity of all that is human; the discovery that life is real, and forms of social and religious existence hollow. The old moorings are torn away, and the soul is drifting, drifting, drifting, very often without compass, except the guidance of an unseen hand, into the vast infinite of God. Then come the lonely words, and no wonder, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?"

2. That solitude was felt by Christ in trial. In the desert, in Pilate's judgment-hall, in the garden, he was alone; and alone must every son of man meet his trial hour. The individuality of the soul necessitates that. Each man is a new soul in this world: untried, with a boundless Possible before him. No one can predict what he may become, prescribe his duties, or mark out his obligations. Each man's own nature has its own peculiar rules;

Digitized by Google

and he must take up his life-plan alone, and persevere in it in a perfect privacy with which no stranger intermeddleth. Each man's temptations are made up of a host of peculiarities, internal and external, which no other mind can measure. You are tried alone; alone you pass into the desert; alone you must bear and conquer in the Agony; alone you must be sifted by the world. There are moments known only to a man's self, when he sits by the poisoned springs of existence, "yearning for a morrow which shall free him from the strife." And there are trials more terrible than that. Not when vicious inclinations are opposed to holy, but when virtue conflicts with virtue, is the real rending of the soul in twain. A temptation, in which the lower nature struggles for mastery, can be met by the whole united force of the spirit. But it is when obedience to a heavenly Father can be only paid by disobedience to an earthly one; or fidelity to duty can be only kept by infidelity to some entangling engagement; or the staight path must be taken over the misery of others; or the counsel of the affectionate friend must be met with a "Get thee behind me, Satan:"—O! it is then, when human advice is unavailable, that the soul feels what it is to be alone.

Once more:—the Redeemer's soul was alone in dying. The hour had come,—they were all gone, and he was, as he predicted, left alone. All that is human drops from us in that hour. Human faces flit and fade, and the sounds of the world become confused. "I shall die alone,"—yes, and alone you live. The philosopher tells us that no atom in creation touches another atom,—they only approach within a certain distance; then the attraction ceaseth, and the invisible something repels,—they only *seem* to touch. No soul touches another soul except at one or two points, and those chiefly external,—a fearful and a lonely thought, but one of the truest of life. Death only realizes that which has been fact all along. In the central deeps of our being we are alone.

II. The spirit or temper of that solitude.

1. Observe its grandeur. I am alone, yet not alone. There is a feeble and sentimental way in which we speak of the Man of sorrows. We turn to the Cross, and the Agony, and the Loneliness to touch the softer feelings—to arouse compassion. You degrade *that* loneliness by your compassion. Compassion! compassion for Him! Adore if you will,—respect and reverence that

Digitized by Google

sublime solitariness with which none but the Father was,—but no pity. Let it draw out the firmer and manlier graces of the soul. Even tender sympathy seems out of place.

For even in human things, the strength that is in a man can be only learnt when he is thrown upon his own resources and left alone. What a man can do in conjunction with others does not test the man. Tell us what he can do alone. It is one thing to defend the truth when you know that your audience are already prepossessed, and that every argument will meet a willing response; and it is another thing to hold the truth when truth must be supported, if at all, alone,—met by cold looks and unsympathizing suspicion. It is one thing to rush on to danger with the shouts and the sympathy of numbers; it is another thing when the lonely chieftain of the sinking ship sees the last boat-full disengage itself, and folds his arms to go down into the majesty of darkness, crushed, but not subdued.

Such and greater far was the strength and majesty of the Savior's solitariness. It was not the trial of the lonely hermit. There is a certain gentle and pleasing melancholy in the life which is lived alone. But there are the forms of nature to speak to him; and he has not the positive opposition of mankind, if he has the absence of actual sympathy. It is a solemn thing, doubtless, to be apart from men, and to feel eternity rushing by like an arrowy river. But the solitude of Christ was the solitude of a crowd. In that single Human bosom dwelt the Thought which was to be the germ of the world's life—a thought unshared, misunderstood, or rejected. Can you not feel the grandeur of those words, when the Man, reposing on His solitary strength, felt the last shadow of perfect isolation pass across His soul:—"My God, my God, why hast *Thou* forsaken me?"

Next, learn from these words self-reliance. "Ye shall leave me alone." Alone, then, the Son of Man was content to be. He threw Himself on His own solitary thought; did not go down to meet the world; but waited, though it might be for ages, till the world should come round to Him. He appealed to the Future, did not aim at seeming consistent, left His contradictions unexplained:—I came from the Father,—I leave the world, and go to the Father. "Now," said they, "thou speakest no proverb:" that is, enigma. But many a hard and enigmatical saying before He had spoken, and He left them all. A thread runs through all

Digitized by Google

true acts, stringing them together into one harmonious chain: but it is not for the Son of God to be anxious to prove their consistency with each other.

This is self-reliance—to repose calmly on the thought which is deepest in our bosoms, and be unmoved if the world will not accept it yet. To live on your own convictions against the world is to overcome the world—to believe that what is truest in you is true for all: to abide by that, and not be over-anxious to be heard or understood, or sympathized with, certain that at last all must acknowledge the same, and that, while you stand firm, the world will come round to you—that is independence. It is not difficult to get away into retirement, and there live upon your own convictions; but to enter into the world, and there live out firmly and fearlessly according to your own conscience—that is Christian greatness.

There is a cowardice in this age which is not Christian. We shrink from the consequences of truth. We look round and cling dependently. We ask what men will think; what others will say; whether they will not stare in astonishment. Perhaps they will; but he who is calculating that will accomplish nothing in this life. The Father—the Father which is with us and in us—what does He think? God's work cannot be done without a spirit of independence. A man is got some way in the Christian life when he has learned to say humbly, and yet majestically, "I dare to be alone."

Lastly, remark the humility of this loneliness. Had the Son of Man simply said, I can be alone, he would have said no more than any proud, self-relying man can say; but when He added, "because the Father is with me," that independence assumed another character, and self-reliance became only another form of reliance upon God. Distinguish between genuine and spurious humility. There is a false humility which says, "It is my own poor thought, and I must not trust it. I must distrust my own reason and judgment, because they are my own. I must not accept the dictates of my own conscience; for is it not my own, and is not trust in self the great fault of our fallen nature?"

Very well. Now, remember something else. There is a Spirit which beareth witness with our spirits; there is a God who "is not far from any of us;" there is a "Light which lighteth every man which cometh into the world." Do not be unnaturally humble. The thought of your own mind perchance is the Thought of God.

Digitized by Google

To refuse to follow that may be to disown God. To take the judgment and conscience of other men to live by, where is the humility of that? From whence did their conscience and judgment come? Was the fountain from which they drew exhausted for you? If they refused like you to rely on their own conscience, and you rely upon it, how are you sure that it is more the Mind of God than your own which you have refused to hear?

Look at it in another way. The charm of the words of great men—those grand sayings which are recognized as true as soon as heard—is this, that you recognize them as wisdom which passed across your own mind. You feel that they are your own thoughts come back to you, else you would not at once admit them: "All that floated across me before, only I could not say it, and did not feel confident enough to assert it, or had not conviction enough to put into words." Yes, God spoke to you what He did to them: only they believed it, said it, trusted the Word within them, and you did not. Be sure that often when you say, "It is only my own poor thought, and I am alone," the real correcting thought is this, "Alone, but the Father is with me,"—therefore I can live by that lonely conviction.

There is no danger in this, whatever timid minds may think—no danger of mistake, if the character be a true one. For we are not in uncertainty in this matter. It has been given us to know our base from our noble hours: to distinguish between the voice which is from above, and that which speaks from below, out of the abyss of our animal and selfish nature. Samuel could distinguish between the impulse—quite a human one—which would have made him select Eliab out of Jesse's sons, and the deeper judgment by which "The *Lord* said, Look not on his countenance, nor on the height of his stature, for I have refused him." Doubtless deep truth of character is required for this: for the whispering voices get mixed together, and we dare not abide by our own thoughts, because we think them our own, and not God's: and this because we only now and then endeavor to know in earnest. It is only given to the habitually true to know the difference. He knew it, because all his blessed life long He could say, "My judgment is just, *because* I seek not my own will, but the will of Him which sent me."

The practical result and inference of all this is a very simple, but a very deep one: the deepest of existence. Let life be a life

Digitized by Google

of faith. Do not go timorously about, inquiring what others think, and what others believe, and what others say. It seems the easiest, it is the most difficult thing in life to do this—believe in God. God is near you. Throw yourself fearlessly upon Him. Trembling mortal, there is an unknown might in your soul. which will wake when you command it. The day may come when all that is human—man and woman—will fall off from you as they did from Him. Let His strength be yours. Be independent of them all now. The Father is with you. Look to Him, and He will save you.

BOOK NOTICES.

"SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST."—This book of 456 pp., published by Draper, of Andover, Mass., is, as the title-page says, a free translation from the German of W. T. GESS, with many additions, by PROF. J. A. REUBELT, of Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

We have read this volume through with much interest and care. It is a Scriptural Inquiry into the Person of Christ,—his divinity and his humanity, with all that relates to these two elements of Christ's nature. The discussion aims to move altogether within the scope of the Scriptures, and all that the New Testament furnishes on this great subject is here brought forth and examined. It is a work evidently of more than ordinary labor, and of profound thought. The great question of the nature of Christ, —his divinity and humanity,—is at this special hour of the highest interest in the religious controversies of our day, and therefore, whatever gives us solid, real help in arriving at sound knowledge on this subject, must be welcomed. This book, we think, has that in it which makes it thus valuable. On the Divinity of Christ, it occupies sound evangelical ground, and is quite full. In the second part, on his humanity, there are some things that we may except against, as, that Christ was not beyond the possibility of sinning, though really sinless. But while there may be some objectionable points in it, still the reader will find this side of the question also very thoroughly and ably discussed.

The book can be had, by application to Prof. Reubelt, at Bloomington, Indiana, at $2.00 per copy (retail price); by the dozen, $18.00. His "Vindication," also, which we have not yet seen, can be had at 50 cts. per copy; per doz., $4.50. C. L. L.

Digitized by Google

A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.—This is the title of a work recently brought out by the "National Publishing Company," Cincinnati, Ohio. It is the joint labor of Rev. Robert Jamieson, D. D., St. Paul's, Glasgow, Scotland; Rev. A. R. Fausset, A. M., St. Cuthbert's, York, England; Rev. David Brown, D. D., Professor of Theology, Aberdeen, Scotland.—These are Bible students of the ripest scholarship, and of rare gifts in the line of labor pursued in this joint production of their pens. We have given the "Commentary" such examination as warrants us in saying that we regard it as the very best work on the whole Bible for popular use, that has yet been given in equal space. It is clear, concise, scholarly, and profound. It is particularly rich in the application of modern learning, archeologic and scientific, both in illustration and defense of the truth of the Bible. As an aid to private students, Sunday School Teachers, and private families, that cannot afford extensive libraries, this Commentary has a value, belonging to no other known to me. It regards some questions, doubtless, from the ecclesiastic standpoint of the authors, but as a whole, the work is remarkably free from such peculiarities. It evidently seeks to rise to the height of independent criticism on all the subjects which it discusses, and must commend itself to the grateful acceptance of all who love the truth and feel an interest in the illustration of the great lessons of the Bible. It is elaborately illustrated with finely executed engravings, and substantially bound in one volume of near 1400 pages. Its typography is of the best, and the Publishers have evidently spared no pains to make their work worthy of the distinguished scholars whose labors they have presented to us in this Commentary.

W. K. PENDLETON.

OBITUARY.

Died, July 3, 1870, at the residence of her mother in Bethany, W. Va., CLARINDA J. BIER, wife of Henry A. Bier, of Moundsville, W. Va., aged 26 years.

Her life had been that of an earnest, humble, trusting Christian,—having constantly before her the example of a more than ordinarily pious and devoted mother. She united with the church at the age of fourteen, and ever afterwards showed by her walk and conversation that it was no merely outward profession, but that in heart and in soul she was indeed a child of God. She died calm and resigned, seeming not only willing, but anxious to depart and be with Jesus, which for her, was far better. Her only source of regret was at leaving her little darling, which had only been hers for a few weeks. But the separation was only for a short time. For in a few months the body of the bright little boy was laid by her side, and its little spirit went to meet hers in that better and brighter land where parting is unknown.

Digitized by Google

THE LAST.

With this number of the HARBINGER, we close our editorial labors.—We take no formal leave of our readers, however,—for we do not expect to withdraw from all intercourse with them. In many ways we hope to commune with them, and we trust with no diminished interest or profit. We cannot write this last page, however, without grateful acknowledgment to the many friends who have expressed regrets at the cessation of the HARBINGER. We are not insensible to the kindness of their approval of our poor labors, and accept it with regret that we have not been more deserving of it. We would gladly pay in kind the debt of personal correspondence, which we are gratified to acknowledge, but which time does not allow us to discharge. Let this be assurance to all who have cheered us with words of approval and regret, that we value their affectionate interest in us only the more, because it was unexpected and can in no wise be recompensed.

I thought, at one time, to indulge in some review of the past—to write a sketchy biograp y of an old friend,—the MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,—and take the younger readers back with me over the years of its life, which were past in conflict for the truth, before they had entered the Sacred Service,—but I could not do it without saying many things which would require more space to explain than one number could afford,—and so I preferred to make a quiet bow, and leave the past to such as like to live in it. Doubtless there are many things which I might have done better, and also some which it were better that I had not done at all. But regrets are vain—and time and opportunity too precious to be wasted in fruitless repining. My comfort is in the consciousness that in all things I have *intended* the best for the interests of the church. To this, I can, without any reservation, turn with assurance, even where success has been the poorest.

The office of religious teacher, we have felt to be the highest and most sacred that can be laid upon us. Fidelity to truth,—unselfish devotion to the interests of the church,—large charity for the errors and prejudices of men,—forbearance in dealing with differences of opinion,—wise foresight for the growing wants and difficulties of growth and development,—and a readiness to sink ambition, personal aggrandizement in fortune or in fame, and even conscious superiority of light and knowledge for the peace and edification of the body—all these are needed qualifications in the public religious teacher, and how rare is the combination of gifts! Yet, the virtue that enables one to see and acknowledge that he does not possess them is almost as rare as is the possession of the gifts,—and hence so many of us are ready to usurp the divine prerogative, and, with no higher call than our own ambition or avarice, or vanity, to assume to be not only magnates in the realm of mind but also

Digitized by Google

to become the licensed teachers of men. This is a fact that calls for consideration and a thoughtful solution of the question, what will we do with it? That our religious teaching shall be committed to heads and hearts which are too small for the work ought not to be thonght of with a moment's toleration. But we have too much to be thankful for to linger now, in these few last words, over what we have not.

Personally, I am indebted beyond what I can ever hope to repay, in fraternal regard, in public respect for what we are conscious we have so defectively done, in editorial courtesy, in encouraging appreciation of the past in the public service of the church, and, above all, in the prayerful fervor with which our readers have so continually borne me up, when I was ready to faint. We can only thank God that He has permitted me to know so much in the greaf heart of the brotherhood, to increase my confidence in the divine nobility of humanity, and make me love and trust them with increasing strength and assurance. The church is not the world—it is far more,—a society of purity, of brotherly love, of wise philanthropy, of social ordinances and heavenly hopes—and its holy bond is the love of God. The more we experience her fellowship the more we feel the power of her divine life. Beautiful are her tabernacles, and sweet the communion of her children! The closer we bind to our hearts the children whom we have seen the nearer do we draw to the Father whom we have not seen.

In many things the signs are very hopeful. Outward corruption is pressing us into closer inward communion, and the almost infinite requirements of theological speculation are compelling us to recur to the simple foundations of the Apostolic Church. The powerlessness of sectarianism is constraining us to search anew for the power of Primitive Christianity, and God is helping his people to come together on the only common ground—faith in Christ and the power of his resurrection,—incorporation into the one body by the initiatory symbol of baptism,—and the fellowship of the Saints through the Holy Spirit in the society of the church, and the joint participation of the eucharist Great progress has been made towards this simple and Apostolic basis of union and co-operation—and to it we must come, or Chrietianity will fail of its power over the masses and lose its efficacy and blessing as the Gospel for the poor.

To this end, with more or less clearness of object and steadiness of aim, the Reformation has been laboring now, for half a century, and there are not a few who see of the fruits of its labor and rejoice. Let us preserve, and as we grow stronger in numbers and power let us also become free of Sectarian unity and exclusiveness,—that our work may still tend to the union of the Saints, and the restoration of the old landmarks of the Apostolic Age.

At the call of the voice of wise brethren we turn our pen now to another line of service, but we work to the same end, and shall labor in the assurance that as in the past, so in the future, the brethren will open their hearts to all that is good and noble, and for the edification of the body.

We ask to be held up on the hands of many prayers, and, renewing our obligation of continued service, pass from the pages of the HARBINGER to more permanent and connected lines of labor and thought, in the hope and faith that the blessing of God will ever go with us in His service.

W. K. P.

Digitized by Google

INDEX TO VOLUME XLI.

Address to the church at Bethany, 701
A Tragedy and its Lessons, 5
Archbishop Hughes, 155
A Demand Answered, 195
A Supposed Dilemma, 215
A Homily, 411
A visit to New England, 469
Australia, 234

Buck, Dr. W. C. on Prep. Eis. 44
Bible in the College & Com. School, 109
Baptizo in the Hellenistic or N. T. Greek, 241, 301, 439
Bethany College, 298, 357
Baccalaureate Sermon, 333
Baptism, Communion, Salvation, 370
Bible Translation among French Protestants, 421
Baptists among the Freedmen, 513
Baptism, Terms Employed for in Ancient Versions of New Test. 515
Bible Revision, 617
Baptists, Union With the 638
Book Notices 715

Christianity & Stoic Philosophy, 673
Christianity of the Present and of the Future, 22
Christian Quarterly, 59, 600
Christ, the Loneliness of 705
Christology, History of Doctrine of 76
Catholic Church and Public Treas. 99
" " " State " 287
Correspondence, 116, 178, 237, 298, 359 417, 466
Christ at the Well of Samaria, 160
Creed in Scotland, 61, 203
Crisis in the Genl. Miss. Society, 331
Circular, 407
Cause in Fayette Co., Alabama Bro. Reeves on 416, 649
Correction, 417
Catholicism, Protestantism Compared with 464
Christ, the Divinity of 603
Cultivation of Christian Love, 635
Curt, 594

Davenport, the Difficulty 45
Deacons, Should the Church have Them? 50
Deacon's office, 136, 250
Dilemma, A Supposed 215
Divorce, inquiries on 267, 374
" The Law of 374
Debate at Dallas City, Oregon, 455
Distinctions effaced in the C. V. 527
Depravity, Total 520

Education, 231
England, Annual Genl. Meeting in 537
Existence of God, History of Doctrine of 481
Europe, The War in 491

Fragrance, 112
Familiarity with the Bible, 174
Fairs, Religious, 285

Gospel of Peace, Is it a 28
Greenwell, Bro. G., Letters from 121, 222, 316
Gen Miss. Society, The Crisis in the 331

Hocker Female College, 57, 476
Hebrew Theocracy, The 66
History of the Doctrine of Christology 76
Hughes, Archbishop 155
Haze and Dust 185
Hyacinthe, Pere on Prophecy 194
" " " Infallibility 509
Horner, W. T., Lectures of 405
Hymn and Tune Book, Christian 476 593
Hymn Book, Christian 539
Harbinger to be Discontinued 598, 658
Health, Influence of Occupation on 586
History of Doctrine of the Trinity 550 601, 661
Holy Spirit, The Personality of 695

Innovations in Public Worship 679
Introduction to Volume XLI 3
Is it a Gospel of Peace? 28
Inevitable Inconsistency 175
Infallibility, American Bishops vs 273
" Father Hyacinthe on 509
Influence of Occupation on Health 586
I Shall be Satisfied 637

John the Beloved 235
John iii : 8 Again, Bro. Burns on 197
Jehu the Zealot 427

Kneeling at the Threshold 297

Lawgiver, Can it mean Teacher or Scribe? 58

Digitized by Google

"Liberal Calvinism," for the Free Imen 71
Literary Notices 115, 176, 595, 715
Letters from Bro. G. Greenwell 121
222, 246, 277, 316, 361
Life, a Fragment 181
Lippincott's Magazine for April 236
Letter from Henry S. Earl 294
L'Echo de Paris 297
Law of Divorce, the 374
"Living Oracles, The" 475
Letter from Father Jno. Udell 655

Methodism Once More 282
Morning Hymn 214
Missionary Meeting 177, 237
Musical Culture 15, 164
Man of Sin, The 39
Missionary Spirit, The 393
M. E. Church, Why did I leave the 563
Messenger, The Christian 650
Mississipi, The Cause in 652

Notice to Publishers 49
New Ideas of Old Things 457
Names of the Most High 471
"No Man Liveth to Himself" 647

Obituaries 118, 238, 359, 477, 598, 659
716
Old Slanders 259
"Our Father's House" 401
Ohio and Penn., A Visit to 531
On the Divinity of Christ 603
On Haze and Dust 181
Overtures for Union with the Bap'ts 638

Prep. Eis., Dr. W. C. Buck on 44
Poisoned Air 75
Physical and Metaphysical Science 228
Protestant Participation in State Aid 171
Position, Our Aims and 227
Place where Light Dwelleth 307, 377
446
Pantheism. the Higher 413
Protestantism Compared with Catholicism 464
Protestants French, Bible Translation among 421
Plea for Union 523, 568, 623
Prayers of a Little Girl 656
Prof. Reubelt 657
Pope, Sympathy With 626
Personality of the Holy Spirit 695
Public Worship, Innovations in 679

Queries 54

Repeated and Prolonged Vigils 107
Reminiscences 146
Religious Fairs 285
Romans V. 12, Queries 349
Revision of the English Scriptures 366
Rev XIX. 13 409
Revision of and Trans. of Lord's Prayer 572
Reubelt, Prof. 657
Revisions, Bible 617
Resolutions of Respect 654

Sin, the Man of 39
Spirit or Wind, Which? 35, 398
Sunday School Collections 116
Shaw, Bro. Knowles, the Evanglist 114
Signs of the Times 134
Samaria, Christ at the Well of 160
Stammering 296
Sunday Schools Attention 298, 359
Stoic Philosophy and Christianity 673
Sympathy With the Pope 626
Spanish Scriptures 325
Scotland, churches in 337
" Creed and Heresy in 61, 203
Sectarianism, What is 236, 351
Shining Pearls 418
"These" Disciples or These Fish, Which? 56, 292
The Hebrew Theocracy 66
The Place where Light Dwelleth 307
377, 446
Tuning Up 324
The Children's Friend 419
The Names of the Most High 471
The Living Oracles 475
The War in Europe 491
The Last 717
The Art of Printing and the Organ 498
Total Depravity 520
Trinity, History of the Doctrine of 550
601, 661
The Temporal Power 581
" Loneliness of Christ 705
" Gospel not a Science 693

Union, Plea for 523, 568, 623
Unitarianism 541

Vigils, Repeated and prolonged 107
Visit to Ohio and Penna. 531

What is Sectarianism 236, 351
West Va. Missionary Society 434
Why Did I Leave the M. E. Church and Join the Christian Church? 563

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
100 Cambridge St.
Charlestown, MA 02129

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google

Digitized by Google